

Spectral instability of characteristic boundary layer flows

Emmanuel Grenier* Yan Guo† Toan T. Nguyen‡

June 17, 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we construct growing modes of the linearized Navier-Stokes equations about generic stationary shear flows of the boundary layer type in a regime of sufficiently large Reynolds number: $R \rightarrow \infty$. Notably, the shear profiles are allowed to be linearly stable at the infinite Reynolds number limit, and so the instability presented is purely due to the presence of viscosity. The formal construction of approximate modes is well-documented in physics literature, going back to the work of Heisenberg, C.C. Lin, Tollmien, Drazin and Reid, but a rigorous construction requires delicate mathematical details, involving for instance a treatment of primitive Airy functions and singular solutions. Our analysis gives exact unstable eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, showing that the solution could grow slowly at the rate of $e^{t/\sqrt{R}}$. A new, operator-based approach is introduced, avoiding to deal with matching inner and outer asymptotic expansions, but instead involving a careful study of singularity in the critical layers by deriving pointwise bounds on the Green function of the corresponding Rayleigh and Airy operators.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Strategy of proof	7
2.1	Operators	7
2.2	Asymptotic behavior as $z \rightarrow +\infty$	8
2.3	Outline of the construction	9
2.4	Function spaces	9

*Equipe Projet Inria NUMED, INRIA Rhône Alpes, Unité de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées., UMR 5669, CNRS et École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46, allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France. Email: egrenier@umpa.ens-lyon.fr

†Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, 182 George street, Providence, RI 02912, USA. Email: Yan_Guo@Brown.edu

‡Department of Mathematics, Penn State University, State College, PA 16803. Email: nguyen@math.psu.edu. TN's research is supported in part by the NSF under grant DMS-1338643.

3	Rayleigh equation	12
3.1	Case $\alpha = 0$	12
3.2	Case $\alpha \neq 0$: an approximate Green function	15
3.3	Case $\alpha \neq 0$: the exact solver for Rayleigh	17
3.4	Exact Rayleigh solutions	17
4	Airy equations	20
4.1	Classical Airy equations	20
4.2	Langer transformation	21
4.3	Resolution of the modified Airy equation	22
4.4	An approximate Green function of primitive Airy equation	25
4.5	Convolution estimates	29
4.6	Resolution of modified Airy equation	30
5	Singularities and Airy equations	33
6	Construction of slow Orr-Sommerfeld modes	40
6.1	Principle of the construction	40
6.2	First order expansion of the slow-decaying mode ϕ_s	44
7	Construction of fast Orr-Sommerfeld modes ϕ_f	45
7.1	Iterative construction of the Airy mode	46
7.2	First order expansion of ϕ_3	47
8	Study of the dispersion relation	49
8.1	Linear dispersion relation	49
8.2	Ranges of α	49
8.3	Expansion of the dispersion relation	50
8.4	Lower stability branch: $\alpha_{\text{low}} \approx R^{-1/4}$	51
8.5	Intermediate zone: $R^{-1/4} \ll \alpha \ll R^{-1/6}$	52
8.6	Upper stability branch: $\alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/6}$	52
8.7	Blasius boundary layer: $\alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/10}$	53

1 Introduction

Study of hydrodynamics stability and the inviscid limit of viscous fluids is one of the most classical subjects in fluid dynamics, going back to the most prominent physicists including Lord Rayleigh, Orr, Sommerfeld, Heisenberg, among many others. It is documented in the physical literature (see, for instance, [8, 1]) that laminar viscous fluids are unstable, or become turbulent, in a small viscosity or high Reynolds number limit. In particular, generic stationary shear flows are linearly unstable for sufficiently large Reynolds numbers. In the present work and in another concurrent work of ours [5], we provide a complete mathematical proof of these physical results.

Specifically, let $u_0 = (U(z), 0)^{tr}$ be a stationary shear flow. We are interested in the linearization of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations about the shear profile:

$$v_t + u_0 \cdot \nabla v + v \cdot \nabla u_0 + \nabla p = \frac{1}{R} \Delta v \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad (1.1b)$$

posed on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, together with the classical no-slip boundary conditions on the walls:

$$v|_{z=0} = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Here v denotes the usual velocity perturbation of the fluid, and p denotes the corresponding pressure. Of interest is the Reynolds number R sufficiently large, and whether the linearized problem is spectrally unstable: the existence of unstable modes of the form $(v, p) = (e^{\lambda t} \tilde{v}(y, z), e^{\lambda t} \tilde{p}(y, z))$ for some λ with $\Re \lambda > 0$.

The spectral problem is a very classical issue in fluid mechanics. A huge literature is devoted to its detailed study. We in particular refer to [1, 13] for the major works of Heisenberg, C.C. Lin, Tollmien, and Schlichting. The studies began around 1930, motivated by the study of the boundary layer around wings. In airplanes design, it is crucial to study the boundary layer around the wing, and more precisely the transition between the laminar and turbulent regimes, and even more crucial to predict the point where boundary layer splits from the boundary. A large number of papers has been devoted to the estimation of the critical Rayleigh number of classical shear flows (plane Poiseuille flow, Blasius profile, exponential suction/blowing profile, among others).

It were Sommerfeld and Orr [14, 10] who initiated the study of the spectral problem via the Fourier normal mode theory. They search for the unstable solutions of the form $e^{i\alpha(y-ct)}(\hat{v}(z), \hat{p}(z))$, and derive the well-known Orr-Sommerfeld equations for linearized viscous fluids:

$$\epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2 \phi = (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2) \phi - U'' \phi, \quad (1.3)$$

with $\epsilon = 1/(i\alpha R)$, where $\phi(z)$ denotes the corresponding stream function, with ϕ and $\partial_z \phi$ vanishing at the boundary $z = 0$. When $\epsilon = 0$, (1.3) reduces to the classical Rayleigh equation, which corresponds to inviscid flows. The singular perturbation theory was developed to construct Orr-Sommerfeld solutions from those of Rayleigh solutions.

Inviscid unstable profiles. If the profile is unstable for the Rayleigh equation, then there exist a spatial frequency α_∞ , an eigenvalue c_∞ with $\text{Im } c_\infty > 0$, and a corresponding eigenvalue ϕ_∞ that solve (1.3) with $\epsilon = 0$ or $R = \infty$. We can then make a perturbative analysis to construct an unstable eigenmode ϕ_R of the Orr-Sommerfeld equation with an eigenvalue $\text{Im } c_R > 0$ for any large enough R . This can be done by adding a boundary sublayer to the inviscid mode ϕ_∞ to correct the boundary conditions for the viscous problem. In fact, we can further check that

$$c_R = c_\infty + \mathcal{O}(R^{-1}), \quad (1.4)$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the time growth is of order $e^{\theta_0 t}$, for some $\theta_0 > 0$. Such a perturbative argument for the inviscid unstable profiles is well-known; see, for instance, Grenier [4] where he rigorously establishes the nonlinear instability of inviscid unstable profiles.

Inviscid stable profiles. There are various criteria to check whether a shear profile is stable to the Rayleigh equation. The most classical one was due to Rayleigh [11]: *A necessary condition for instability is that $U(z)$ must have an inflection point*, or its refined version by Fjortoft [1]: *A necessary condition for instability is that $U''(U - U(z_0)) < 0$ somewhere in the flow, where z_0 is a point at which $U''(z_0) = 0$* . For instance, the classical Blasius boundary layer profile is linearly stable to the Rayleigh equation.

For such a stable profile, all the spectrum of the Rayleigh equation is imbedded on the imaginary axis: $\text{Re}(-i\alpha c_\infty) = \alpha \text{Im } c_\infty = 0$, and thus it is not clear whether a perturbative argument to construct solutions (c_R, ϕ_R) to (1.3) would yield stability ($\text{Im } c_R < 0$) or instability ($\text{Im } c_R > 0$). It is documented in the physical literature that *generic shear profiles (including those which are inviscid stable) are linearly unstable for large Reynolds numbers*. Heisenberg [6, 7], then Tollmien and C. C. Lin [8] were among the first physicists to use asymptotic expansions to study the instability; see also Drazin and Reid [1] for a complete account of the physical literature on the subject. Roughly speaking, there are lower and upper marginal stability branches $\alpha_{\text{low}}(R), \alpha_{\text{up}}(R)$ so that whenever $\alpha \in [\alpha_{\text{low}}(R), \alpha_{\text{up}}(R)]$, there exist an unstable eigenvalue c_R and an eigenfunction $\phi_R(z)$ to the Orr-Sommerfeld problem. The asymptotic behavior of these branches α_{low} and α_{up} depends on the profile:

- for plane Poiseuille flow in a channel: $U(z) = 1 - z^2$ for $-1 < z < 1$,

$$\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) = A_{1c} R^{-1/7} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\text{up}}(R) = A_{2c} R^{-1/11}. \quad (1.5)$$

- for boundary layer profiles,

$$\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) = A_{1c} R^{-1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\text{up}}(R) = A_{2c} R^{-1/6}. \quad (1.6)$$

- for Blasius (a particular boundary layer) profile,

$$\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) = A_{1c} R^{-1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\text{up}}(R) = A_{2c} R^{-1/10}. \quad (1.7)$$

Their formal analysis has been compared with modern numerical computations and also with experiments, showing a very good agreement; see [1, Figure 5.5] for a sketch of the marginal stability curves. In this paper, we are interested in the case of boundary layers.

In his works [16, 17, 18], Wasow developed the turning point theory to rigorously validate the formal asymptotic expansions used by the physicists in a full neighborhood of the turning points (or the critical layers in our present paper). It appears however that Wasow himself did not explicitly study how his approximate solutions depend on the three small parameters α , ϵ , and $\text{Im } c$ in the Orr-Sommerfeld equations, nor apply his theory to resolve the stability problem (see his discussions on pages 868–870, [16], or Chapter One, [18]).

Even though Drazin and Reid ([1]) indeed provide many delicate asymptotic analysis in different regimes with different matching conditions near the critical layers, it is mathematically unclear how to combine their “local” analysis into a single convergent “global expansion” to produce an exact growing mode for the Orr-Sommerfeld equation. To our knowledge, remarkably, after all these efforts, a complete rigorous construction of an unstable growing mode is still elusive for such a fundamental problem.

Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $U(z)$ be an arbitrary shear profile with $U'(0) > 0$ and satisfy*

$$\sup_{z \geq 0} |\partial_z^k (U(z) - U_+) e^{\eta_0 z}| < +\infty, \quad k = 0, \dots, 4,$$

for some constants U_+ and $\eta_0 > 0$. Let $\alpha_{\text{low}}(R)$ and $\alpha_{\text{up}}(R)$ be defined as in (1.6) for general boundary layer profiles, or defined as in (1.7) for the Blasius profiles: those with additional assumptions: $U''(0) = U'''(0) = 0$.

Then, there is a critical Reynolds number R_c so that for all $R \geq R_c$ and all $\alpha \in (\alpha_{\text{low}}(R), \alpha_{\text{up}}(R))$, there exist a nontrivial triple $c(R), \hat{v}(z; R), \hat{p}(z; R)$, with $\text{Im } c(R) > 0$, such that $v_R := e^{i\alpha(y-ct)} \hat{v}(z; R)$ and $p_R := e^{i\alpha(y-ct)} \hat{p}(z; R)$ solve the problem (1.1a)-(1.1b) with the no-slip boundary conditions. In the case of instability, there holds the following estimate for the growth rate of the unstable solutions:

$$\alpha \text{Im } c(R) \approx R^{-1/2},$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.1 allows general shear profiles. The instability is found, even for inviscid stable flows such as monotone or Blasius boundary flows, and thus is due to the presence of viscosity. For a fixed viscosity, nonlinear instability follows from the spectral instability; see [2] for arbitrary spectrally unstable steady states. However, in the vanishing viscosity limit, linear to nonlinear instability is a very delicate issue, primarily due to the fact that there are no available, comparable bounds on the linearized solution operator as compared to the maximal growing mode. Available analyses (for instance, [3, 4]) do not appear applicable in the inviscid limit.

As mentioned earlier, we construct the unstable solutions via the Fourier normal mode method. Precisely, let us introduce the stream function ψ through

$$v = \nabla^\perp \psi = (\partial_z, -\partial_y) \psi, \quad \psi(t, y, z) := \phi(z) e^{i\alpha(y-ct)}, \quad (1.8)$$

with $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the spatial frequency $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and the temporal eigenvalue $c \in \mathbb{C}$. The equation for vorticity $\omega = \Delta\psi$ becomes the classical Orr–Sommerfeld equation for ϕ

$$\epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2\phi = (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi - U''\phi, \quad z \geq 0, \quad (1.9)$$

with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{i\alpha R}$. The no-slip boundary condition on v then becomes

$$\alpha\phi = \partial_z\phi = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad z = 0, \quad (1.10)$$

In addition, as we work with Sobolev spaces, we also impose the zero boundary conditions at infinity:

$$\phi \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_z\phi \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad z \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (1.11)$$

Clearly, if $\phi(z)$ solves the Orr–Sommerfeld problem (1.9)–(1.11), then the velocity v defined as in (1.8) solves the linearized Navier–Stokes problem with the pressure p solving

$$-\Delta p = \nabla U \cdot \nabla v, \quad \partial_z p|_{z=0,2} = -\partial_z^2 \partial_y \psi|_{z=0,2}.$$

Throughout the paper, we study the Orr–Sommerfeld problem.

Delicacy in the construction is primarily due to the formation of critical layers. To see this, let (c_0, ϕ_0) be a solution to the Rayleigh problem with $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let z_0 be the point at which

$$U(z_0) = c_0. \quad (1.12)$$

Since the coefficient of the highest-order derivative in the Rayleigh equation vanishes at $z = z_0$, the Rayleigh solution $\phi_0(z)$ has a singularity of the form: $1 + (z - z_0) \log(z - z_0)$. A perturbation analysis to construct an Orr–Sommerfeld solution ϕ_ϵ out of ϕ_0 will face a singular source $\epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2\phi_0$ at $z = z_0$. To deal with the singularity, we need to introduce the critical layer ϕ_{cr} that solves

$$\epsilon\partial_z^4\phi_{\text{cr}} = (U - c)\partial_z^2\phi_{\text{cr}}$$

When z is near z_0 , $U - c$ is approximately $z - z_c$ with z_c near z_0 , and the above equation for the critical layer becomes the classical Airy equation for $\partial_z^2\phi_{\text{cr}}$. This shows that the critical layer mainly depends on the fast variable: $\phi_{\text{cr}} = \phi_{\text{cr}}(Y)$ with $Y = (z - z_c)/\epsilon^{1/3}$.

In the literature, the point z_c is occasionally referred to as a turning point, since the eigenvalues of the associated first-order ODE system cross at $z = z_c$ (or more precisely, at those which satisfy $U(z_c) = c$), and therefore it is delicate to construct asymptotic solutions that are analytic across different regions near the turning point. In his work, Wasow fixed the turning point to be zero, and were able to construct asymptotic solutions in a full neighborhood of the turning point.

In the present paper, we introduce a new, operator-based approach, which avoids dealing with inner and outer asymptotic expansions, but instead constructs the Green’s function, and therefore the inverse, of the corresponding Rayleigh and Airy operators. The Green’s function of the critical layer (Airy) equation is complicated by the fact that we have to deal

with the second primitive Airy functions, not to mention that the argument Y is complex. The basic principle of our construction, for instance, of a slow decaying solution, will be as follows. We start with an exact Rayleigh solution ϕ_0 (solving (1.9) with $\epsilon = 0$). This solution then solves (1.9) approximately up to the error term $\epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2\phi_0$, which is singular at $z = z_0$ since ϕ_0 is of the form $1 + (z - z_0)\log(z - z_0)$ inside the critical layer. We then correct ϕ_0 by adding a critical layer profile ϕ_{cr} constructed by convoluting the Green's function of the primitive Airy operator against the singular error $\epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2\phi_0$. The resulting solution $\phi_0 + \phi_{\text{cr}}$ solves (1.9) up to a smaller error that consists of no singularity. An exact slow mode of (1.9) is then constructed by inductively continuing this process. For a fast mode, we start the induction with a second primitive Airy function.

Notation. Throughout the paper, the profile $U = U(z)$ is kept fixed. Let c_0 and z_0 be real numbers so that $U(z_0) = c_0$. We extend $U(z)$ analytically in a neighborhood of z_0 in $\mathbb{C}$. We then let c and z_c be two complex numbers in the neighborhood of (c_0, z_0) in $\mathbb{C}^2$ so that $U(z_c) = c$. It follows by the analytic expansions of $U(z)$ near z_0 and z_c that $|\text{Im } c| \approx |\text{Im } z_c|$, provided that $U'(z_0) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we have taken $z_0 = 0$ in the statement of the theorem.

Further notation. We shall use C_0 to denote a universal constant that may change from line to line, but is independent of α and R . We also use the notation $f = \mathcal{O}(g)$ or $f \lesssim g$ to mean that $|f| \leq C_0|g|$, for some constant C_0 . Similarly, $f \approx g$ if and only if $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$. Finally, when no confusion is possible, inequalities involved with complex numbers $|f| \leq g$ are understood as $|f| \leq |g|$.

2 Strategy of proof

Let us outline the strategy of the proof before going into the technical details and computations. Our ultimate goal is to construct four independent solutions of the fourth order differential equation (1.9) and then combine them in order to satisfy boundary conditions (1.10)-(1.11), yielding the linear dispersion relation. The unstable eigenvalues are then found by carefully studying the dispersion relation.

2.1 Operators

For our convenience, let us introduce the following operators. We denote by Orr the Orr-Sommerfeld operator

$$Orr(\phi) := (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi - U''\phi - \epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2\phi, \quad (2.1)$$

by Ray_α the Rayleigh operator

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi) := (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi - U''\phi, \quad (2.2)$$

by *Diff* the diffusive part of the Orr-Sommerfeld operator,

$$Diff(\phi) := -\varepsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2 \phi, \quad (2.3)$$

by *Airy* the modified Airy equation

$$Airy(\phi) := \varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi - (U - c + 2\varepsilon \alpha^2) \partial_z^2 \phi, \quad (2.4)$$

and finally, by *Reg* the regular zeroth order part of the Orr-Sommerfeld operator

$$Reg(\phi) := -\left[\varepsilon \alpha^4 + U'' + \alpha^2(U - c)\right] \phi. \quad (2.5)$$

Clearly, there hold identities

$$Orr = Ray_\alpha + Diff = -Airy + Reg. \quad (2.6)$$

2.2 Asymptotic behavior as $z \rightarrow +\infty$

In order to construct the independent solutions of (1.9), let us study their possible behavior at infinity. One observes that as $z \rightarrow +\infty$, solutions of (1.9) must behave like solutions of constant-coefficient limiting equation:

$$\varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi = (U_+ - c + 2\varepsilon \alpha^2) \partial_z^2 \phi - \alpha^2(\varepsilon \alpha^2 + U_+ - c) \phi, \quad (2.7)$$

with $U_+ = U(+\infty)$. Solutions to (2.7) are of the form $Ce^{\lambda z}$ with $\lambda = \pm \lambda_s$ or $\lambda = \pm \lambda_f$, where

$$\lambda_s = \pm \alpha + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad \lambda_f = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(U_+ - c)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha).$$

Therefore, we can find two solutions ϕ_1, ϕ_2 with a “slow behavior” $\lambda \approx \pm \alpha$ (one decaying and the other growing) and two solutions ϕ_3, ϕ_4 with a fast behavior where λ is of order $\pm 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ (one decaying and the other growing). As it will be clear from the proof, the first two slow-behavior solutions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 will be perturbations of eigenfunctions of the Rayleigh equation. The other two, ϕ_3 and ϕ_4 , are specific to the Orr Sommerfeld equation and will be linked to the solutions of the classical Airy equation. More precisely, four independent solutions of (1.9) to be constructed are

- ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 which are perturbations of the decreasing/increasing eigenvector of the Rayleigh equation. To leading order in small α and ε , ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 behave at infinity, respectively, like $(U(z) - c) \exp(-\alpha z)$ and $(U(z) - c) \exp(\alpha z)$.
- ϕ_3 and ϕ_4 which are perturbations of the solutions to the second primitive Airy equation, which are of order $\exp(\pm |Z|^{3/2})$ as $|Z| \rightarrow \infty$. Here $Z = \eta(z)/\varepsilon^{1/3}$ denotes the fast variable near the critical layer whose size is of order $\varepsilon^{1/3}$, and $\eta(z)$ denotes the Langer’s variable which is asymptotically $z^{2/3}$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$.

A solution to the problem (1.9)–(1.11) is defined as a linear combination of ϕ_1, ϕ_2, ϕ_3 , and ϕ_4 , solving the imposed boundary conditions. Keeping in mind the asymptotic behavior of ϕ_2 and ϕ_4 , we observe that any bounded solution of (1.9)–(1.11) is in fact just a combination of ϕ_1 and ϕ_3 . We will therefore restrict our construction to the study of ϕ_1 and ϕ_3 .

2.3 Outline of the construction

We now present the idea of the iterative construction. We start from the Rayleigh solution ϕ_{Ray} so that

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi_{Ray}) = f.$$

By definition, we have

$$Orr(\phi_{Ray}) = f - Diff(\phi_{Ray}). \quad (2.8)$$

Here we observe that the error term on the right hand side $Diff(\phi_{Ray}) = \epsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2 \phi_{Ray}$, denoted by $O_1(z)$, is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ in L^∞ . It might be helpful to note that the operator $\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2$ and so $Diff(\cdot)$ annihilate the slow decay term $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha z})$ in ϕ_{Ray} . Near the critical layer, the Rayleigh solution generally contains a singular solution of the form $(z - z_c) \log(z - z_c)$, and therefore ϕ_{Ray} admits the same singularity at $z = z_c$. As a consequence, $Diff(\phi_{Ray})$ consists of singularities of orders $\log(z - z_c)$ and $(z - z_c)^{-k}$, for $k = 1, 2, 3$. To remove these singularities, we then use the *Airy* operator. More precisely, the *Airy* operator smoothes out the singularity inside the critical layer. In term of spatial decaying at infinity, the inverse of the *Airy*($\cdot$) operator introduces some linear growth in the spatial variable, which prevents the convergence of our iteration. We then introduce yet another modified Airy operator $\mathcal{A}_a(\cdot)$ so that

$$Airy(\phi) = \mathcal{A}_a(\partial_z^2 \phi).$$

We then proceed our construction by defining

$$\phi_1 := \phi_{Ray} + Airy^{-1}(A_s) + \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_a^{-1}(I_0), \quad (2.9)$$

in which $A_s = \chi Diff(\phi_{Ray})$ denoting the singular part, $I_0 = (1 - \chi) Diff(\phi_{Ray})$ denoting the regular part, and $\partial_z^{-1} = -\int_z^\infty$. Here, $\chi(z)$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi = 1$ on $[0, 1]$ and zero on $[2, \infty)$. We then get

$$Orr(\phi_1) = f + O_1, \quad O_1 := Reg\left(Airy^{-1}(A_s) + \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_a^{-1}(I_0)\right).$$

Our main technical task is to show that O_1 is indeed in the next vanishing order, when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, or precisely the iteration operator

$$Iter := Reg \circ \left[Airy^{-1} \circ \chi Diff + \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_a^{-1} \circ (1 - \chi) Diff \right] \circ Ray_\alpha^{-1} \quad (2.10)$$

is contractive in suitable function spaces. Note that our approach avoids to deal with inner and outer expansions, but requires a careful study of the singularities and delicate estimates on the resolvent solutions.

2.4 Function spaces

Throughout the paper, z_c is some complex number and will be fixed, depending only on c , through $U(z_c) = c$.

We will use the function spaces X_p^η , for $p \geq 0$, to denote the spaces consisting of measurable functions $f = f(z)$ such that the norm

$$\|f\|_{X_p^\eta} := \sup_{|z-z_c| \leq 1} \sum_{k=0}^p |(z-z_c)^k \partial_z^k f(z)| + \sup_{|z-z_c| \geq 1} \sum_{k=0}^p |e^{\eta z} \partial_z^k f(z)|$$

is bounded. In case $p = 0$, we simply write $X_\eta, \|\cdot\|_\eta$ in places of $X_0^\eta, \|\cdot\|_{X_0^\eta}$, respectively.

We also introduce the function spaces $Y_p^\eta \subset X_p^\eta$, $p \geq 0$, such that for any $f \in Y_p^\eta$, the function f additionally satisfies

$$|f(z)| \leq C, \quad |\partial_z f(z)| \leq C(1 + |\log(z - z_c)|), \quad |\partial_z^k f(z)| \leq C(1 + |z - z_c|^{1-k})$$

for all $|z - z_c| \leq 1$ and for $2 \leq k \leq p$. The best constant C in the previous bounds defines the norm $\|f\|_{Y_p^\eta}$.

Let us now sketch the key estimates of the paper. The first point is, thanks to almost explicit computations, we can construct an inverse operator Ray^{-1} for Ray_α . Note that if $Ray_\alpha(\phi) = f$, then

$$(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi = \frac{U''}{U-c}\phi + \frac{f}{U-c}. \quad (2.11)$$

Hence, provided $U - c$ does not vanish (which is the case when c is complex), using classical elliptic regularity we see that if $f \in C^k$ then $\phi \in C^{k+2}$. We thus gain two derivatives. However the estimates on the derivatives degrade as $z - z_c$ goes smaller. The main point is that the weight $(z - z_c)^l$ is enough to control this singularity. Moreover, deriving l times (2.11) we see that $\partial_z^{2+l}\phi$ is bounded by $C/(z - z_c)^{l+1}$ if $f \in X_{\eta,k}$. Hence, we gain one $z - z_c$ factor in the derivative estimates between f and ϕ . In addition, since $e^{\pm\alpha z}$ is in the kernel of $\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2$, if f decays like $e^{-\eta z}$, one can at best expect ϕ to decay as $e^{-\alpha z}$ at infinity. Combining, if f lies in X_k^η , ϕ lies in Y_{k+2}^α , with a gain of two derivatives and of an extra $z - z_c$ weight, but losses a rapid decay at infinity. As a matter of fact we will construct an inverse Ray^{-1} which is continuous from X_k^η to Y_{k+2}^α for any k .

Using Airy functions, their double primitives, and a special variable and unknown transformation known in the literature as Langer transformation, we can construct an almost explicit inverse $Airy^{-1}$ to our $Airy$ operator. We then have to investigate $Airy^{-1} \circ Diff$. Formally it is of order 0, however it is singular, hence to control it we need to use two derivatives, and to make it small we need a $z - z_c$ factor in the norms. After tedious computations on almost explicit Green functions we prove that $Airy^{-1} \circ Diff$ has a small norm as an operator from Y_{k+2}^α to X_k^η .

Last, Reg is bounded from X_k^η to X_k^η , since it is a simple multiplication by a bounded function. Combining all these estimates we are able to construct exact solutions of Orr Sommerfeld equations, starting from solutions of Rayleigh equations or from Airy equations. This leads to the construction of four independent solutions. Each such solution is defined as a convergent serie, which gives its expansion. It then remains to combine all the various

terms of all these solutions to get the dispersion relation of Orr Sommerfeld. The careful analysis of this dispersion relation gives our instability result.

The plan of the paper follows the previous lines.

3 Rayleigh equation

In this part, we shall construct an exact inverse for the Rayleigh operator Ray_α for small α and so find the complete solution to

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi) = (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi - U''\phi = f \quad (3.1)$$

To do so, we first invert the Rayleigh operator Ray_0 when $\alpha = 0$ by exhibiting an explicit Green function. We then use this inverse to construct an approximate inverse to Ray_α operator through the construction of an approximate Green function. Finally, the construction of the exact inverse of Ray_α follows by an iterative procedure.

Precisely, we will prove in this section the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let p be in $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\eta > 0$. Assume that $Im\ c \neq 0$ and $\alpha|\log Im\ c|$ is sufficiently small. Then, there exists an operator $RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(\cdot)$ from X_p^η to Y_{p+2}^α (defined by (3.20)) so that*

$$Ray_\alpha(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(f)) = f. \quad (3.2)$$

In addition, there holds

$$\|RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(f)\|_{Y_{p+2}^\alpha} \leq C\|f\|_{X_p^\eta}(1 + |\log(Im\ c)|),$$

for all $f \in X_p^\eta$.

3.1 Case $\alpha = 0$

As mentioned, we begin with the Rayleigh operator Ray_0 when $\alpha = 0$. We will find the inverse of Ray_0 . More precisely, we will construct the Green function of Ray_0 and solve

$$Ray_0(\phi) = (U - c)\partial_z^2\phi - U''\phi = f. \quad (3.3)$$

We recall that z_c is defined by solving the equation $U(z_c) = c$. We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $Im\ c \neq 0$. There are two independent solutions $\phi_{1,0}, \phi_{2,0}$ of $Ray_0(\phi) = 0$ with the Wronskian determinant*

$$W(\phi_{1,0}, \phi_{2,0}) := \partial_z\phi_{2,0}\phi_{1,0} - \phi_{2,0}\partial_z\phi_{1,0} = 1.$$

Furthermore, there are analytic functions $P_1(z), P_2(z), Q(z)$ with $P_1(z_c) = P_2(z_c) = 1$ and $Q(z_c) \neq 0$ so that the asymptotic descriptions

$$\phi_{1,0}(z) = (z - z_c)P_1(z), \quad \phi_{2,0}(z) = P_2(z) + Q(z)(z - z_c)\log(z - z_c) \quad (3.4)$$

hold for z near z_c , and

$$|\phi_{1,0}(z) - V_+| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0|z|}, \quad |\partial_z\phi_{2,0}(z) - \frac{1}{V_+}| \leq Cze^{-\eta_0|z|}, \quad (3.5)$$

as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$, for some positive constants C, η_0 and for $V_+ = U_+ - c$. Here when $z - z_c$ is on the negative real axis, we take the value of $\log(z - z_c)$ to be $\log|z - z_c| - i\pi$.

Proof. First, we observe that

$$\phi_{1,0}(z) = U(z) - c$$

is an exact solution of $Ray_0(\phi) = 0$. In addition, the claimed asymptotic expansion for $\phi_{1,0}$ clearly holds for z near z_c since $U(z_c) = c$. We then construct a second particular solution $\phi_{2,0}$, imposing the Wronskian determinant to be one:

$$W[\phi_{1,0}, \phi_{2,0}] = \partial_z \phi_{2,0} \phi_{1,0} - \phi_{2,0} \partial_z \phi_{1,0} = 1.$$

From this, the variation-of-constant method $\phi_{2,0}(z) = C(z)\phi_{1,0}(z)$ then yields

$$\phi_{1,0} C \partial_z \phi_{1,0} + \phi_{1,0}^2 \partial_z C - \partial_z \phi_{1,0} C \phi_{1,0} = 1.$$

This gives $\partial_z C(z) = 1/\phi_{1,0}^2(z)$ and therefore

$$\phi_{2,0}(z) = (U(z) - c) \int_{1/2}^z \frac{1}{(U(y) - c)^2} dy. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that $\phi_{2,0}$ is well defined if the denominator does not vanishes, hence if $\text{Im } c \neq 0$ or if $\text{Im } c = 0$ and $z > z_c$. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(U(c) - U(z_c))^2} &= \frac{1}{(U'(z_c)(z - z_c) + U''(z_c)(z - z_c)^2/2 + \dots)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{U'(z_c)^2(z - z_c)^2} - \frac{U''(z_c)}{U'(z_c)^3} \frac{1}{z - z_c} + \text{holomorphic}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\phi_{2,0} = -\frac{U(z) - c}{U'(z_c)^2(z - z_c)} - \frac{U''(z_c)}{U'(z_c)^3} (U(z) - c) \log(z - z_c) + \text{holomorphic}. \quad (3.7)$$

As $\phi_{2,0}$ is not properly defined for $z < z_c$ when $z_c \in \mathbb{R}^+$, it is coherent to choose the determination of the logarithm which is defined on $\mathbb{C} - \mathbb{R}^-$.

With such a choice of the logarithm, $\phi_{2,0}$ is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} - \{z_c + \mathbb{R}^-\}$. In particular if $\Im z_c = 0$, $\phi_{2,0}$ is holomorphic in z excepted on the half line $z_c + \mathbb{R}^-$. For $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi_{2,0}$ is holomorphic as a function of c excepted if $z - z_c$ is real and negative, namely excepted if $z < z_c$. For a fixed z , $\phi_{2,0}$ is an holomorphic function of c provided z_c does not cross $\mathbb{R}^+$, and provided $z - z_c$ does not cross $\mathbb{R}^-$. The Lemma then follows from the explicit expression (3.7) of $\phi_{2,0}$. $\square$

Let $\phi_{1,0}, \phi_{2,0}$ be constructed as in Lemma 3.2. Then the Green function $G_{R,0}(x, z)$ of the Ray_0 operator can be defined by

$$G_{R,0}(x, z) = \begin{cases} (U(x) - c)^{-1} \phi_{1,0}(z) \phi_{2,0}(x), & \text{if } z > x, \\ (U(x) - c)^{-1} \phi_{1,0}(x) \phi_{2,0}(z), & \text{if } z < x. \end{cases}$$

Here we note that c is complex with $\text{Im } c \neq 0$ and so the Green function $G_{R,0}(x, z)$ is a well-defined function in (x, z) , continuous across $x = z$, and its first derivative has a jump across $x = z$. Let us now introduce the inverse of Ray_0 as

$$\text{RaySolver}_0(f)(z) := \int_0^{+\infty} G_{R,0}(x, z) f(x) dx. \quad (3.8)$$

The following lemma asserts that the operator $\text{RaySolver}_0(\cdot)$ is in fact well-defined from X_0^η to Y_2^0 , which in particular shows that $\text{RaySolver}_0(\cdot)$ gains two derivatives, but losses the fast decay at infinity.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $\text{Im } c \neq 0$. For any $f \in X_0^\eta$, the function $\text{RaySolver}_0(f)$ is a solution to the Rayleigh problem (3.3). In addition, $\text{RaySolver}_0(f) \in Y_2^0$, and there holds*

$$\|\text{RaySolver}_0(f)\|_{Y_2^0} \leq C(1 + |\log \text{Im } c|) \|f\|_{X_0^\eta},$$

for some universal constant C .

Proof. As long as it is well-defined, the function $\text{RaySolver}_0(f)(z)$ solves the equation (3.3) at once by a direct calculation, upon noting that

$$\text{Ray}_0(G_{R,0}(x, z)) = \delta_x(z),$$

for each fixed x .

Next, by scaling, we assume that $\|f\|_{X_0^\eta} = 1$. By Lemma 3.2, it is clear that $\phi_{1,0}(z)$ and $\phi_{2,0}(z)/(1+z)$ are uniformly bounded. Thus, by direct computations, we have

$$|G_{R,0}(x, z)| \leq C \max\{(1+x), |x - z_c|^{-1}\}. \quad (3.9)$$

That is, $G_{R,0}(x, z)$ grows linearly in x for large x and has a singularity of order $|x - z_c|^{-1}$ when x is near z_c , for arbitrary $z \geq 0$. Since $|f(z)| \leq e^{-\eta z}$, the integral (3.8) is well-defined and satisfies

$$|\text{RaySolver}_0(f)(z)| \leq C \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta x} \max\{(1+x), |x - z_c|^{-1}\} dx \leq C(1 + |\log \text{Im } c|),$$

in which we used the fact that $\text{Im } z_c \approx \text{Im } c$.

Finally, as for derivatives, we need to check the order of singularities for z near z_c . We note that $|\partial_z \phi_{2,0}| \leq C(1 + |\log(z - z_c)|)$, and hence

$$|\partial_z G_{R,0}(x, z)| \leq C \max\{(1+x), |x - z_c|^{-1}\} (1 + |\log(z - z_c)|).$$

Thus, $\partial_z \text{RaySolver}_0(f)(z)$ behaves as $1 + |\log(z - z_c)|$ near the critical layer. In addition, from the Ray_0 equation, we have

$$\partial_z^2(\text{RaySolver}_0(f)) = \frac{U''}{U - c} \text{RaySolver}_0(f) + \frac{f}{U - c}. \quad (3.10)$$

This proves that $\text{RaySolver}_0(f) \in Y_2^0$ by definition of the function space Y_2^0 . $\square$

Lemma 3.4. Assume that $\text{Im } c \neq 0$. Let p be in $\{0, 1, 2\}$. For any $f \in X_p^\eta$, we have

$$\|RaySolver_0(f)\|_{Y_{p+2}^0} \leq C\|f\|_{X_p^\eta}(1 + |\log(\text{Im } c)|)$$

Proof. This is Lemma 3.3 when $p = 0$. When $p = 1$ or 2 , the lemma follows directly from the identity (3.10). $\square$

3.2 Case $\alpha \neq 0$: an approximate Green function

Let $\phi_{1,0}$ and $\phi_{2,0}$ be the two solutions of $Ray_0(\phi) = 0$ that are constructed above in Lemma 3.2. We note that solutions of $Ray_0(\phi) = f$ tend to a constant value as $z \rightarrow +\infty$ since $\phi_{1,0} \rightarrow U_+ - c$. We now construct normal mode solutions to the Rayleigh equation with $\alpha \neq 0$

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi) = (U - c)(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)\phi - U''\phi = f \quad (3.11)$$

By looking at the spatially asymptotic limit of the Rayleigh equation, we observe that there are two normal mode solutions of (3.11) whose behaviors are as $e^{\pm\alpha z}$ at infinity. In order to study the mode which behaves like $e^{-\alpha z}$ we introduce

$$\phi_{1,\alpha} = \phi_{1,0}e^{-\alpha z}, \quad \phi_{2,\alpha} = \phi_{2,0}e^{-\alpha z}. \quad (3.12)$$

A direct calculation shows that the Wronskian determinant

$$W[\phi_{1,\alpha}, \phi_{2,\alpha}] = \partial_z \phi_{2,\alpha} \phi_{1,\alpha} - \phi_{2,\alpha} \partial_z \phi_{1,\alpha} = e^{-2\alpha z}$$

is non zero. In addition, we can check that

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi_{j,\alpha}) = -2\alpha(U - c)\partial_z \phi_{j,0}e^{-\alpha z} \quad (3.13)$$

We are then led to introduce an approximate Green function $G_{R,\alpha}(x, z)$ defined by

$$G_{R,\alpha}(x, z) = \begin{cases} (U(x) - c)^{-1}e^{-\alpha(z-x)}\phi_{1,0}(z)\phi_{2,0}(x), & \text{if } z > x \\ (U(x) - c)^{-1}e^{-\alpha(z-x)}\phi_{1,0}(x)\phi_{2,0}(z), & \text{if } z < x. \end{cases}$$

Again, like $G_{R,0}(x, z)$, the Green function $G_{R,\alpha}(x, z)$ is “singular” near $z = z_c$ with two sources of singularities: one arising from $1/(U(x) - c)$ for x near z_c and the other coming from the $(z - z_c)\log(z - z_c)$ singularity of $\phi_{2,0}(z)$. By a view of (3.13), it is clear that

$$Ray_\alpha(G_{R,\alpha}(x, z)) = \delta_x - 2\alpha(U - c)E_{R,\alpha}(x, z), \quad (3.14)$$

for each fixed x . Here the error term $E_{R,\alpha}(x, z)$ is defined by

$$E_{R,\alpha}(x, z) = \begin{cases} (U(x) - c)^{-1}e^{-\alpha(z-x)}\partial_z \phi_{1,0}(z)\phi_{2,0}(x), & \text{if } z > x \\ (U(x) - c)^{-1}e^{-\alpha(z-x)}\phi_{1,0}(x)\partial_z \phi_{2,0}(z), & \text{if } z < x. \end{cases}$$

We then introduce an approximate inverse of the operator Ray_α defined by

$$RaySolver_\alpha(f)(z) := \int_0^{+\infty} G_{R,\alpha}(x, z)f(x)dx \quad (3.15)$$

and the error remainder

$$Err_{R,\alpha}(f)(z) := 2\alpha(U(z) - c) \int_0^{+\infty} E_{R,\alpha}(x, z) f(x) dx \quad (3.16)$$

Lemma 3.5. *Assume that $\text{Im } c \neq 0$, and let p be 0, 1, or 2. For any $f \in X_p^\eta$, with $\eta > \alpha$, the function $RaySolver_\alpha(f)$ is well-defined in Y_{p+2}^α , satisfying*

$$Ray_\alpha(RaySolver_\alpha(f)) = f + Err_{R,\alpha}(f).$$

Furthermore, there hold

$$\|RaySolver_\alpha(f)\|_{Y_{p+2}^\alpha} \leq C(1 + |\log \text{Im } c|) \|f\|_{X_p^\eta}, \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\|Err_{R,\alpha}(f)\|_{Y_p^\eta} \leq C\alpha(1 + |\log(\text{Im } c)|) \|f\|_{X_p^\eta}, \quad (3.18)$$

for some universal constant C .

Proof. The proof follows similarly to that of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4. In fact, the proof of the right order of singularities near the critical layer follows identically from that of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4.

Let us check the right behavior at infinity. Consider the case $p = 0$ and assume $\|f\|_{X_0^\eta} = 1$. Similarly to the estimate (3.9), Lemma 3.2 and the definition of $G_{R,\alpha}$ yield

$$|G_{R,\alpha}(x, z)| \leq C e^{-\alpha(z-x)} \max\{(1+x), |x - z_c|^{-1}\}.$$

Hence, by definition,

$$|RaySolver_\alpha(f)(z)| \leq C e^{-\alpha z} \int_0^\infty e^{\alpha x} e^{-\eta x} \max\{(1+x), |x - z_c|^{-1}\} dx$$

which is clearly bounded by $C(1 + |\log \text{Im } c|) e^{-\alpha z}$. This proves the right exponential decay of $RaySolver_\alpha(f)(z)$ at infinity, for all $f \in X_0^\eta$.

Next, by definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Err_{R,\alpha}(f)(z) &= -2\alpha(U(z) - c) \partial_z \phi_{2,0}(z) \int_z^\infty e^{-\alpha(z-x)} \phi_{1,0}(x) \frac{f(x)}{U(x) - c} dx \\ &\quad - 2\alpha(U(z) - c) \partial_z \phi_{1,0}(z) \int_0^z e^{-\alpha(z-x)} \phi_{2,0}(x) \frac{f(x)}{U(x) - c} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f(z), \partial_z \phi_{1,0}(z)$ decay exponentially at infinity, the exponential decay of $Err_{R,\alpha}(f)(z)$ follows directly from the above integral representation. It remains to check the order of singularity near the critical layer. Clearly, for bounded z , we have

$$|E_{R,\alpha}(x, z)| \leq C(1 + |\log(z - z_c)|) e^{\alpha x} \max\{1, |x - z|^{-1}\}.$$

The lemma then follows at once, using the extra factor of $U - c$ in the front of the integral (3.16) to bound the $\log(z - z_c)$ factor. The estimates for derivatives follow similarly. $\square$

3.3 Case $\alpha \neq 0$: the exact solver for Rayleigh

We now construct the exact solver for the Rayleigh operator by iteration. Let us denote

$$S_0(z) := \text{RaySolver}_\alpha(f)(z), \quad E_0(z) := \text{Err}_{R,\alpha}(f)(z).$$

It then follows that $\text{Ray}_\alpha(S_0)(z) = f(z) + E_0(z)$. Inductively, we define

$$S_n(z) := -\text{RaySolver}_\alpha(E_{n-1})(z), \quad E_n(z) := -\text{Err}_{R,\alpha}(E_{n-1})(z),$$

for $n \geq 1$. It is then clear that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\text{Ray}_\alpha\left(\sum_{k=0}^n S_k(z)\right) = f(z) + E_n(z). \quad (3.19)$$

This leads us to introduce the exact solver for Rayleigh defined by

$$\text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(f) := \text{RaySolver}_\alpha(f)(z) - \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \text{RaySolver}_\alpha(E_n)(z). \quad (3.20)$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By a view of (3.18), we have

$$\|E_n\|_\eta = \|(\text{Err}_{R,\alpha})^n(f)\|_\eta \leq C^n \alpha^n (1 + |\log(\text{Im } c)|)^n \|f\|_\eta,$$

which implies that $E_n \rightarrow 0$ in X_η as $n \rightarrow \infty$ as long as $\alpha \log \text{Im } c$ is sufficiently small. In addition, by a view of (3.17),

$$\|\text{RaySolver}_\alpha(E_n)\|_{Y_2^\alpha} \leq C C^n \alpha^n (1 + |\log(\text{Im } c)|)^n \|f\|_\eta.$$

This shows that the series

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \text{RaySolver}_\alpha(E_n)(z)$$

converges in Y_2^α , assuming that $\alpha \log \text{Im } c$ is small.

Next, by taking the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.19), the equation (3.2) holds by definition at least in the distributional sense. The estimates when z is near z_c follow directly from the similar estimates on $\text{RaySolver}_\alpha(\cdot)$; see Lemma 3.5. The proof of Proposition 3.1 is thus complete. $\square$

3.4 Exact Rayleigh solutions

We shall construct two independent exact Rayleigh solutions by iteration, starting from the approximate Rayleigh solutions $\phi_{j,\alpha}$ defined as in (3.12).

Lemma 3.6. *For α small enough so that $\alpha |\log \text{Im } c| \ll 1$, there exist two independent functions $\phi_{\text{Ray},\pm} \in e^{\pm \alpha z} L^\infty$ such that*

$$\text{Ray}_\alpha(\phi_{\text{Ray},\pm}) = 0, \quad W[\phi_{\text{Ray},+}, \phi_{\text{Ray},-}](z) = \alpha.$$

Furthermore, we have the following expansions in L^∞ :

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{Ray,-}(z) &= e^{-\alpha z} \left(U - c + \mathcal{O}(\alpha) \right), \\ \phi_{Ray,+}(z) &= e^{\alpha z} \mathcal{O}(1),\end{aligned}$$

as $z \rightarrow \infty$. At $z = 0$, there hold

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{Ray,-}(0) &= U_0 - c + \alpha(U_+ - U_0)^2 \phi_{2,0}(0) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha(\alpha + |z_c|)) \\ \phi_{Ray,+}(0) &= \alpha \phi_{2,0}(0) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)\end{aligned}$$

with $\phi_{2,0}(0) = \frac{1}{U'_c} - \frac{2U''_c}{U'^2_c} z_c \log z_c + \mathcal{O}(z_c)$.

Proof. Let us start with the decaying solution $\phi_{Ray,-}$, which is now constructed by induction. Let us introduce

$$\psi_0 = e^{-\alpha z} (U - c), \quad e_0 = -2\alpha(U - c)U' e^{-\alpha z},$$

and inductively for $k \geq 1$,

$$\psi_k = -RaySolver_\alpha(e_{k-1}), \quad e_k = -Err_{R,\alpha}(e_{k-1}).$$

We also introduce

$$\phi_N = \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k.$$

By definition, it follows that

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi_N) = e_N, \quad \forall N \geq 1.$$

We observe that $\|e_0\|_{\eta+\alpha} \leq C\alpha$ and $\|\psi_0\|_\alpha \leq C$. Inductively for $k \geq 1$, by the estimate (3.18), we have

$$\|e_k\|_{\eta+\alpha} \leq C\alpha(1 + |\log(\operatorname{Im} c)|) \|e_{k-1}\|_{\eta+\alpha} \leq C\alpha(C\alpha(1 + |\log(\operatorname{Im} c)|))^{k-1},$$

and by Lemma 3.5,

$$\|\psi_k\|_\alpha \leq C(1 + |\log(\operatorname{Im} c)|) \|e_{k-1}\|_{\eta+\alpha} \leq (C\alpha(1 + |\log(\operatorname{Im} c)|))^k.$$

Thus, for sufficiently small α , the series ϕ_N converges in X_α and the error term $e_N \rightarrow 0$ in $X_{\eta+\alpha}$. This proves the existence of the exact decaying Rayleigh solution $\phi_{Ray,-}$ in X_α , or in $e^{-\alpha z} L^\infty$.

As for the growing solution, we simply define

$$\phi_{Ray,+} = \alpha \phi_{Ray,-}(z) \int_{1/2}^z \frac{1}{\phi_{Ray,-}^2(y)} dy.$$

By definition, $\phi_{Ray,+}$ solves the Rayleigh equation identically. Next, since $\phi_{Ray,-}(z)$ tends to $e^{-\alpha z}(U_+ - c + \mathcal{O}(\alpha))$, $\phi_{Ray,+}$ is of order $e^{\alpha z}$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, at $z = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_1(0) &= -RaySolver_\alpha(e_0)(0) = -\phi_{2,\alpha}(0) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{2\alpha x} \phi_{1,\alpha}(x) \frac{e_0(x)}{U(x) - c} dx \\ &= 2\alpha \phi_{2,0}(0) \int_0^{+\infty} U'(U - c) dz = \alpha(U_+ - U_0)(U_+ + U_0 - 2c) \phi_{2,0}(0) \\ &= \alpha(U_+ - U_0)^2(U_+ + U_0 - 2c) \phi_{2,0}(0) + 2\alpha(U_+ - U_0)(U_0 - c) \phi_{2,0}(0).\end{aligned}$$

From the definition, we have $\phi_{Ray,-}(0) = U_0 - c + \psi_1(0) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$. This proves the lemma, upon using that $U_0 - c = \mathcal{O}(z_c)$. $\square$

4 Airy equations

Our ultimate goal is to inverse the Airy operator defined as in (2.4), and thus we wish to construct the Green function for the primitive Airy equation

$$\text{Airy}(\phi) := \varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi - (U(z) - c + 2\varepsilon \alpha^2) \partial_z^2 \phi = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

4.1 Classical Airy equations

The classical Airy functions play a major role in the analysis near the critical layer. The aim of this section is to recall some properties of the classical Airy functions. The classical Airy equation is

$$\partial_z^2 \phi - z \phi = 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (4.2)$$

In connection with the Orr-Somerfeld equation with ϵ being complex, we are interested in the Airy functions with argument

$$z = e^{i\pi/6} x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let us state precisely what we will be needed. These classical results can be found in [9, 15]; see also [1, Appendix].

Lemma 4.1. *The classical Airy equation (4.2) has two independent solutions $Ai(z)$ and $Ci(z)$ so that the Wronskian determinant of Ai and Ci equals*

$$W(Ai, Ci) = Ai(z)Ci'(z) - Ai'(z)Ci(z) = 1. \quad (4.3)$$

In addition, $Ai(e^{i\pi/6}x)$ and $Ci(e^{i\pi/6}x)$ converge to 0 as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ (x being real), respectively. Furthermore, there hold asymptotic bounds:

$$\left| Ai(k, e^{i\pi/6}x) \right| \leq C|x|^{-k/2-1/4} e^{-\sqrt{2|x|}x/3}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\left| Ci(k, e^{i\pi/6}x) \right| \leq C|x|^{-k/2-1/4} e^{\sqrt{2|x|}x/3}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.5)$$

in which $Ai(0, z) = Ai(z)$, $Ai(k, z) = \partial_z^{-k} Ai(z)$ for $k \leq 0$, and $Ai(k, z)$ is the k^{th} primitives of $Ai(z)$ for $k \geq 0$ and is defined by the inductive path integrals

$$Ai(k, z) = \int_{\infty}^z Ai(k-1, w) dw$$

so that the integration path is contained in the sector with $|\arg(z)| < \pi/3$. The Airy functions $Ci(k, z)$ for $k \neq 0$ are defined similarly.

The following lemma whose proof can again be found in the mentioned physical references will be of use in the latter analysis.

Lemma 4.2. *Let S_1 be the sector in the complex plane such that the argument is between $2\pi/3$ and $4\pi/3$. There hold expansions*

$$\begin{aligned} Ai(1, z) &\approx -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}z^{3/4}}e^{-\frac{2}{3}z^{3/2}}(1 + \mathcal{O}(|z|^{-3/2})) \\ Ai(2, z) &\approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}z^{5/4}}e^{-\frac{2}{3}z^{3/2}}(1 + \mathcal{O}(|z|^{-3/2})) \end{aligned}$$

for all large z in S_1 . In addition, at $z = 0$, there holds

$$Ai(k, 0) = \frac{(-1)^k 3^{-(k+2)/3}}{\Gamma(\frac{k+2}{3})}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

in which $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function defined by $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1}e^{-t}dt$.

4.2 Langer transformation

Since the profile U depends on z in a non trivial manner, we make a change of variables and unknowns in order to go back to classical Airy equations studied in the previous section. This change is very classical in physical literature, and called the Langer's transformation.

Definition 4.3. *By Langer's transformation $(z, \phi) \mapsto (\eta, \Phi)$, we mean $\eta = \eta(z)$ defined by*

$$\eta(z) = \left[\frac{3}{2} \int_{z_c}^z \left(\frac{U-c}{U'_c} \right)^{1/2} dz \right]^{2/3} \quad (4.6)$$

and $\Phi = \Phi(\eta)$ defined by the relation

$$\partial_z^2 \phi(z) = \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi(\eta), \quad (4.7)$$

in which $\dot{z} = \frac{dz(\eta)}{d\eta}$ and $z = z(\eta)$ is the inverse of the map $\eta = \eta(z)$.

Direct calculation gives a useful fact $(U-c)\dot{z}^2 = U'_c\eta$. Next, using that $c = U(z_c)$, one observes that for z near z_c , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(z) &= \left[\frac{3}{2} \int_{z_c}^z \left(z - z_c + \frac{U''_c}{U'_c}(z - z_c)^2 + \mathcal{O}(|z - z_c|^3) \right)^{1/2} dz \right]^{2/3} \\ &= z - z_c + \frac{1}{10} \frac{U''_c}{U'_c} (z - z_c)^2 + \mathcal{O}(|z - z_c|^3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

In particular, we have

$$\eta'(z) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(|z - z_c|), \quad (4.9)$$

and thus the inverse $z = z(\eta)$ is locally well-defined and locally increasing near $z = z_c$. In addition,

$$\dot{z} = \frac{1}{\eta'(z)} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(|z - z_c|).$$

Next, we note that $\eta'(z)^2 = \frac{U-c}{U'_c \eta(z)}$, which is nonzero away from $z = z_c$. Thus, the inverse of $\eta = \eta(z)$ exists for all $z \geq 0$.

In addition, by a view of the definition (4.6) and the fact that $(U-c)\dot{z}^2 = U'_c \eta$, we have

$$|\eta(z)| \leq C(1+|z|)^{2/3}, \quad |\eta'(z)| \leq C(1+|z|)^{-1/3}, \quad |\dot{z}(\eta(z))| \leq C(1+|z|)^{1/3}, \quad (4.10)$$

for some universal constant C .

The following lemma links (4.1) with the classical Airy equation.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(z, \phi) \mapsto (\eta, \Phi)$ be the Langer's transformation defined as in Definition 4.3. Assume that $\Phi(\eta)$ solves*

$$\epsilon \partial_\eta^2 \Phi - U'_c \eta \Phi = f(\eta).$$

Then, $\phi = \phi(z)$ solves

$$\text{Airy}(\phi) = \dot{z}^{-3/2} f(\eta(z)) + \epsilon [\partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} - 2\alpha^2] \partial_z^2 \phi(z)$$

Proof. Derivatives of the identity $\partial_z^2 \phi(z) = \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi(\eta)$ are

$$\partial_z^3 \phi(z) = \dot{z}^{-1/2} \partial_\eta \Phi + \partial_z \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z^4 \phi(z) &= \dot{z}^{-3/2} \partial_\eta^2 \Phi + [\partial_z \dot{z}^{-1/2} + \dot{z}^{-1} \partial_z \dot{z}^{1/2}] \partial_\eta \Phi + \partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi \\ &= \dot{z}^{-3/2} \partial_\eta^2 \Phi + \partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

This proves that

$$\partial_z^2 (\dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi(\eta)) = \dot{z}^{-3/2} \partial_\eta^2 \Phi(\eta) + \partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi(\eta) \quad (4.12)$$

Putting these together and using the fact that $(U-c)\dot{z}^2 = U'_c \eta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \partial_z^4 \phi - (U(z) - c) \partial_z^2 \phi &= \epsilon \dot{z}^{-3/2} \partial_\eta^2 \Phi - (U-c) \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi + \epsilon \partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \Phi \\ &= \dot{z}^{-3/2} f(\eta) + \epsilon \partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} \partial_z^2 \phi(z). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows. $\square$

4.3 Resolution of the modified Airy equation

In this section we will construct the Green function for the Airy equation:

$$\mathcal{A}_a(\Phi) := \epsilon \partial_z^2 \Phi - (U(z) - c) \Phi = f. \quad (4.13)$$

Let us denote

$$\delta = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{U'_c} \right)^{1/3} = e^{-i\pi/6} (\alpha R U'_c)^{-1/3},$$

and introduce the notation $X = \delta^{-1} \eta(x)$ and $Z = \delta^{-1} \eta(z)$, where $\eta(z)$ is the Langer's variable defined as in (4.6). We define an approximate Green function for the Airy equation:

$$G_a(x, z) = i\delta\pi\epsilon^{-1} \dot{x} \begin{cases} Ai(X)Ci(Z), & \text{if } x > z, \\ Ai(Z)Ci(X), & \text{if } x < z, \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

with $\dot{x} = \dot{z}(\eta(x))$. It follows that $G_a(x, z)$ satisfies the jump conditions across $x = z$:

$$[G_a(x, z)]|_{x=z} = 0, \quad [\epsilon \partial_z G_a(x, z)]|_{x=z} = 1.$$

By definition, we have

$$\varepsilon \partial_z^2 G_a(x, z) - (U - c)G_a(x, z) = \delta_x(z) + E_a(x, z), \quad (4.15)$$

with $E_a(x, z) = i\pi\eta''(z)\dot{x}Ai(X)Ci'(Z)$.

Let us detail some estimates on G_a as a warm up for the following sections. Let us consider the case: $x < z$. By the estimates on the Airy functions obtained from Lemma 4.1, we get

$$|\partial_z^k Ai(e^{i\pi/6}z)\partial_x^\ell Ci(e^{i\pi/6}x)| \leq C|z|^{k/2-1/4}|x|^{\ell/2-1/4} \exp\left(\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{2|x|x} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{2|z|z}\right), \quad (4.16)$$

for $k \geq 0$, and for x, z bounded away from zero. Similar bounds can easily be obtained for the case $x > z$. We remark that the polynomial growth in x in the above estimate can be easily replaced by the growth in z , up to an exponentially decaying term.

We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $G_a(x, z)$ be the approximate Green function defined as in (4.14), and $E_a(x, z)$ as defined in (4.15). Also let $X = \eta(x)/\delta$ and $Z = \eta(z)/\delta$. For $k, \ell = 0, 1$, there hold pointwise estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_z^\ell \partial_x^k G_a(x, z)| &\leq C\delta^{-2-k-\ell}(1+|z|)^{(1-k-\ell)/3}(1+|Z|)^{(k+\ell-1)/2}e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z||X-Z|}}, \\ |\partial_z^\ell \partial_x^k E_a(x, z)| &\leq C\delta^{-k-\ell}(1+|z|)^{(-3-k-\ell)/3}(1+|Z|)^{(k+\ell)/2}e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z||X-Z|}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. The lemma follows directly from (4.16), upon noting that the pre-factor in terms of the lower case z is due to the Langer's change of variables. $\square$

Let us next give a few convolution estimates.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $G_a(x, z)$ be the approximate Green function defined as in (4.14), and $E_a(x, z)$ as defined in (4.15). Also let $f \in X_\eta$, for some $\eta > 0$. Then there is some constant C so that*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \partial_z^k G_a(x, \cdot) f(x) dx \right\|_\eta \leq C\delta^{-1-k} \|f\|_\eta \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \partial_z^k E_a(x, \cdot) f(x) dx \right\|_\eta \leq C\delta^{1-k} \|f\|_\eta \quad (4.19)$$

for $k = 0, 1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\|f\|_\eta = 1$. For $k = 0, 1$, using the bounds from Lemma 4.5 and noting that $Z = \eta(z)/\delta \approx (1 + |z|)^{2/3}/\delta$ as z becomes large, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty |\partial_z^k G_a(x, z) f(x)| dx \\ & \leq C \delta^{-2-k} \int_0^\infty (1+z)^{(1-k)/3} e^{-\eta z} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{|Z|} |X-Z|} dx \\ & \leq C \delta^{-2-k} (1+z)^{1-k/3} e^{-\eta z} \int_0^\infty (1+x)^{-1/3} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{|Z|} |X-Z|} \delta dX \\ & \leq C \delta^{-1-k} e^{-\eta|z|}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the change of variable $dx = \delta \dot{z}^{-1} dX$ with $\dot{z} \approx (1 + |x|)^{1/3}$. Similar estimates hold for $E_a(x, z)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

An approximate solution Φ of (4.13) is given by the convolution

$$\mathcal{A}_a^{-1}(f) = \int_0^{+\infty} G_a(x, z) f(x) dx. \quad (4.20)$$

Indeed, a direct calculation yields

$$\mathcal{A}_a(\mathcal{A}_a^{-1}(f)) = f + Err_a(f),$$

with the error term defined by

$$Err_a(f) = \int_0^\infty E_a(x, z) f(x) dx.$$

The convolution lemma (Lemma 4.6) in particular yields

$$\|Err_a(f)\|_\eta \leq C \delta \|f\|_\eta, \quad (4.21)$$

for all $f \in X_\eta$. That is, $Err_a(f)$ is indeed of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ in X_η . For this reason, we may now define by iteration an exact solver for the Airy operator $\mathcal{A}_a(\cdot)$. Let us start with a fixed $f \in X_\eta$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n &= -\mathcal{A}_a^{-1}(E_{n-1}) \\ E_n &= -Err_a(E_{n-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, with $E_0 = f$. Let us also denote

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k.$$

It follows by induction that

$$\mathcal{A}_a(S_n) = f + E_n,$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Now by (4.21), we have

$$\|E_n\|_\eta \leq C\delta\|E_{n-1}\|_\eta \leq (C\delta)^n\|f\|_\eta.$$

This proves that $E_n \rightarrow 0$ in X_η as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since δ is small. In addition, by a view of Lemma 4.6, we have

$$\|\phi_n\|_\eta \leq C\delta^{-1}\|E_{n-1}\|_\eta \leq C\delta^{-1}(C\delta)^{n-1}\|f\|_\eta.$$

This shows that ϕ_n converges to zero in X_η as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and furthermore the series

$$S_n \rightarrow S_\infty$$

in X_η as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some $S_\infty \in X_\eta$. We then denote $\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(f) = S_\infty$, for each $f \in X_\eta$. In addition, we have $\mathcal{A}_a(S_\infty) = f$, that is, $\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(f)$ is the exact solver for the modified Airy operator. A similar estimate follows for derivatives.

To summarize, we have proved the following proposition.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that δ is sufficiently small. There exists an exact solver $\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(\cdot)$ as a well-defined operator from X_η to X_η , for arbitrary fixed $\eta > 0$, so that*

$$\mathcal{A}_a(\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(f)) = f.$$

In addition, there holds

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(f)\|_{X_k^\eta} \leq C\delta^{-1-k}\|f\|_\eta, \quad k = 0, 1,$$

for some positive constant C .

4.4 An approximate Green function of primitive Airy equation

In this section we will construct an approximate Green function for (4.1). By a view of the Langer's transformation, let us introduce an auxiliary Green function

$$G_{\text{aux}}(X, Z) = i\delta\pi\varepsilon^{-1} \begin{cases} Ai(X)Ci(Z), & \text{if } \xi > \eta, \\ Ai(Z)Ci(X), & \text{if } \xi < \eta. \end{cases}$$

By definition, we have

$$\varepsilon\partial_\eta^2 G_{\text{aux}}(X, Z) - U'_c\eta G_{\text{aux}}(X, Z) = \delta_\xi(\eta). \quad (4.23)$$

Next, let us take $\xi = \eta(x)$ and $\eta = \eta(z)$, where $\eta(\cdot)$ is the Langer's transformation and denote $\dot{x} = 1/\eta'(x)$ and $\dot{z} = 1/\eta'(z)$. By a view of (4.7), we define the function $G(x, z)$ so that

$$\partial_z^2 G(x, z) = \dot{x}^{3/2}\dot{z}^{1/2}G_{\text{aux}}(\delta^{-1}\eta(x), \delta^{-1}\eta(z)), \quad (4.24)$$

in which the factor $\dot{x}^{3/2}$ was added simply to normalize the jump of $G(x, z)$. It then follows from Lemma 4.4 together with $\delta_{\eta(x)}(\eta(z)) = \delta_x(z)$ that

$$\text{Airy}(G(x, z)) = \delta_x(z) + \varepsilon(\partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} - 2\alpha^2)\partial_z^2 G(x, z). \quad (4.25)$$

That is, $G(x, z)$ is indeed an approximate Green function of the primitive Airy operator $\epsilon \partial_z^4 - (U - c) \partial_z^2$ up to a small error term of order $\epsilon \partial_z^2 G = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$. It remains to solve (4.24) for $G(x, z)$, retaining the jump conditions on $G(x, z)$ across $x = z$.

In view of primitive Airy functions, let us denote

$$\tilde{C}i(1, z) = \delta^{-1} \int_0^z \dot{y}^{1/2} Ci(\delta^{-1} \eta(y)) dy, \quad \tilde{C}i(2, z) = \delta^{-1} \int_0^z \tilde{C}i(1, y) dy$$

and

$$\tilde{A}i(1, z) = \delta^{-1} \int_\infty^z \dot{y}^{1/2} Ai(\delta^{-1} \eta(y)) dy, \quad \tilde{A}i(2, z) = \delta^{-1} \int_\infty^z \tilde{A}i(1, y) dy.$$

Thus, together with our convention that the Green function $G(x, z)$ should vanish as z goes to $+\infty$ for each fixed x , we are led to introduce

$$G(x, z) = i\delta^3 \pi \epsilon^{-1} \dot{x}^{3/2} \begin{cases} \left[Ai(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{C}i(2, z) + \delta^{-1} a_1(x)(z - x) + a_2(x) \right], & \text{if } x > z, \\ Ci(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{A}i(2, z), & \text{if } x < z, \end{cases} \quad (4.26)$$

in which $a_1(x), a_2(x)$ are chosen so that the jump conditions (see below) hold. Clearly, by definition, $G(x, z)$ solves (4.24), and hence (4.25). Here the jump conditions on the Green function read:

$$[G(x, z)]|_{x=z} = [\partial_z G(x, z)]|_{x=z} = [\partial_z^2 G(x, z)]|_{x=z} = 0 \quad (4.27)$$

and

$$[\epsilon \partial_z^3 G(x, z)]|_{x=z} = 1. \quad (4.28)$$

We note that from (4.24) and the jump conditions on $G_{\text{aux}}(X, Z)$ across $X = Z$, the above jump conditions of $\partial_z^2 G$ and $\partial_z^3 G$ follow easily. In order for the jump conditions on $G(x, z)$ and $\partial_z G(x, z)$, we take

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(x) &= Ci(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{A}i(1, x) - Ai(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{C}i(1, x), \\ a_2(x) &= Ci(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{A}i(2, x) - Ai(\delta^{-1} \eta(x)) \tilde{C}i(2, x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $G(x, z)$ be defined as in (4.26). Then $G(x, z)$ is an approximate Green function of the Airy operator (4.1). Precisely, there holds*

$$\text{Airy}(G(x, z)) = \delta_x(z) + \text{Err}_A(x, z) \quad (4.30)$$

for each fixed x , where $\text{Err}_A(x, z)$ denotes the error kernel defined by

$$\text{Err}_A(x, z) = \epsilon(\partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} - 2\alpha^2) \partial_z^2 G(x, z). \quad (4.31)$$

It appears convenient to denote by $\tilde{G}(x, z)$ and $E(x, z)$ the localized and non-localized part of the Green function, respectively. Precisely, we denote

$$\tilde{G}(x, z) = i\delta^3\pi\epsilon^{-1}\dot{x}^{3/2} \begin{cases} Ai(\delta^{-1}\eta(x))\tilde{Ci}(2, z), & \text{if } x > z, \\ Ci(\delta^{-1}\eta(x))\tilde{Ai}(2, z), & \text{if } x < z, \end{cases}$$

and

$$E(x, z) = i\delta^3\pi\epsilon^{-1}\dot{x}^{3/2} \begin{cases} \delta^{-1}a_1(x)(z - x) + a_2(x), & \text{if } x > z, \\ 0, & \text{if } x < z. \end{cases}$$

Let us give some bounds on the Green function, using the known bounds on $Ai(\cdot)$ and $Ci(\cdot)$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $G(x, z) = \tilde{G}(x, z) + E(x, z)$ be the Green function defined as in (4.26), and let $X = \eta(x)/\delta$ and $Z = \eta(z)/\delta$. There hold pointwise estimates*

$$|\partial_z^\ell \partial_x^k \tilde{G}(x, z)| \leq C\delta^{-k-\ell}(1 + |z|)^{(4-k-\ell)/3}(1 + |Z|)^{(k+\ell-3)/2}e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|}. \quad (4.32)$$

Similarly, for the non-localized term, we have

$$|E(x, z)| \leq C(1 + x)^{4/3}(1 + |X|)^{-3/2} + C(1 + x)^{1/3}|x - z|, \quad (4.33)$$

for $x > z$.

Proof. We recall that for z near z_c , we can write $\dot{z}(\eta(z)) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(|z - z_c|)$, which in particular yields that $\frac{1}{2} \leq \dot{z}(\eta(z)) \leq \frac{3}{2}$ for z sufficiently near z_c . In addition, by a view of the definition (4.6), $\eta(z)$ grows like $(1 + |z|)^{2/3}$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$; see (4.10).

Let us assume that $z \geq 1$. It suffices to give estimates on $\tilde{Ai}(k, z), \tilde{Ci}(k, z)$. With notation $Y = \eta(y)/|\delta|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{Ai}(1, z)| &\leq \delta^{-1} \int_z^\infty |y^{1/2} Ai(e^{i\pi/6}Y)| dy \leq C\delta^{-1} \int_z^\infty (1 + y)^{1/6}(1 + |Y|)^{-1/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Y|}Y/3} dy \\ &\leq C \int_Z^\infty (1 + y)^{1/6}(1 + |Y|)^{-1/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Y|}Y/3} (1 + y)^{1/3} dY \\ &\leq C \int_Z^\infty (1 + y)^{1/2}(1 + |Y|)^{-1/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Z|}Y/3} dY \\ &\leq C(1 + z)^{1/2}(1 + |Z|)^{-3/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Z|}Z/3}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{Ai}(2, z)| &\leq \delta^{-1} \int_z^\infty |\tilde{Ai}(1, y)| dy \leq C\delta^{-1} \int_z^\infty (1 + y)^{1/2}(1 + |Y|)^{-3/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Y|}Y/3} dy \\ &\leq C \int_Z^\infty (1 + y)^{5/6}(1 + |Y|)^{-3/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Z|}Y/3} dY \\ &\leq C(1 + z)^{5/6}(1 + |Z|)^{-5/4}e^{-\sqrt{2|Z|}Z/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{C}i(1, z)| &\leq \delta^{-1} \int_0^z |\dot{y}^{1/2} Ci(e^{i\pi/6} Y)| dy \leq C\delta^{-1} \int_0^z (1+y)^{1/6} (1+|Y|)^{-1/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Y|^{1/3}} dy \\
&\leq C \int_0^z (1+z)^{1/2} (1+|Y|)^{-1/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Y|^{1/3}} dY \\
&\leq C(1+z)^{1/2} (1+|Z|)^{-3/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Z|^{1/3}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{C}i(2, z)| &\leq \delta^{-1} \int_0^z |\tilde{C}i(1, y)| dy \leq C \int_0^z (1+y)^{5/6} (1+|Y|)^{-3/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Y|^{1/3}} dY \\
&\leq C(1+z)^{5/6} (1+|Z|)^{-5/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Z|^{1/3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the case that $z \leq 1$, the above estimates remain valid. Indeed, first consider the case that $z \geq \operatorname{Re} z_c$. In this case, we still have $|Y| \geq |Z|$ whenever $y \geq z$, and so the estimates on $\tilde{A}i(k, z)$ follow in the same way as done above. Next, consider the case that $z \leq \operatorname{Re} z_c$. In this case, we have

$$|\tilde{A}i(1, z)| \leq (1+|Z|)^{-3/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2/3}}, \quad |\tilde{A}i(2, z)| \leq C(1+|Z|)^{-5/4} e^{\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2/3}}.$$

That is, like $Ai(\eta(z)/\delta)$, the functions $\tilde{A}i(k, z)$ grow exponentially fast as z tends to zero and is away from the critical layer. Similarly, we also have

$$|\tilde{C}i(1, z)| \leq C(1+|Z|)^{-3/4} e^{-\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2/3}}, \quad |\tilde{C}i(2, z)| \leq C(1+|Z|)^{-5/4} e^{-\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2/3}},$$

for $z \leq \operatorname{Re} z_c$. The estimates become significant when the critical layer is away from the boundary layer, that is when $\delta \ll |z_c|$.

By combining together these bounds and those on $Ai(\cdot)$, $Ci(\cdot)$, the claimed bounds on $\tilde{G}(x, z)$ follow easily. Derivative bounds are also obtained in the same way. Finally, using the above bounds on $\tilde{A}i(k, z)$ and $\tilde{C}i(k, z)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_x^k a_1(x)| &\leq C\delta^{-k} (1+x)^{1/2-k/3} (1+|X|)^{k/2-1} \\
|\partial_x^k a_2(x)| &\leq C\delta^{-k} (1+x)^{5/6-k/3} (1+|X|)^{k/2-3/2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

upon noting that the exponents in $Ai(\cdot)$ and $Ci(\cdot)$ are cancelled out identically.

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Similarly, we also obtain the following simple lemma.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\operatorname{Err}_A(x, z)$ be the error kernel defined as in (4.31), and let $X = \eta(x)/\delta$ and $Z = \eta(z)/\delta$. There hold*

$$|\partial_z^k \partial_x^\ell \operatorname{Err}_A(x, z)| \leq C\delta^{1-k-\ell} (1+|z|)^{-(k+4)/3} (1+|Z|)^{(k+\ell-1)/2} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|}. \tag{4.35}$$

Proof. We recall that

$$\operatorname{Err}_A(x, z) = \epsilon(\partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} - 2\alpha^2) \partial_z^2 G(x, z).$$

Thus, the lemma follows directly from the estimates on $\partial_z^2 G(x, z)$. $\square$

4.5 Convolution estimates

In this section, we establish the following convolution estimates.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $G(x, z) = \tilde{G}(x, z) + E(x, z)$ be the approximate Green function of the primitive Airy equation constructed as in Lemma 4.8, and let $f \in X_\eta$, $\eta > 0$. Then there is some constant C so that*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \partial_z^k \tilde{G}(x, \cdot) f(x) dx \right\|_{\eta'} \leq \frac{C\delta^{1-k}}{\eta - \eta'} \|f\|_\eta, \quad (4.36)$$

and

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \partial_z^k E(x, \cdot) f(x) dx \right\|_{\eta'} \leq \frac{C}{\eta - \eta'} \|f\|_\eta, \quad (4.37)$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and for $\eta' < \eta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\|f\|_\eta = 1$. First, consider the case $|z| \leq 1$. Using the pointwise bounds obtained in Lemma 4.9, we have

$$\int_0^\infty |\tilde{G}(x, z) f(x)| dx \leq C_0 \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{|Z|} |X-Z|} e^{-\eta x} dx \leq C\delta,$$

upon noting that $dx = \delta \dot{z}^{-1}(\eta(x)) dX$ with $\dot{z}(\eta(x)) \approx (1 + |x|)^{1/3}$. Here the growth of $\dot{z}(\eta(x))$ in x is clearly controlled by $e^{-\eta x}$. Similarly, since $|E(x, z)| \leq C(1 + x)^{4/3}$, we have

$$\int_z^\infty |E(x, z) f(x)| dx \leq C \int_z^\infty (1 + x)^{4/3} e^{-\eta x} dx \leq C,$$

which proves the estimates for $|z| \leq 1$.

Next, consider the case $z \geq 1$, and $k = 0, 1, 2$. Again using the bounds from Lemma 4.9 and noting that $Z = \eta(z)/\delta \approx (1 + |z|)^{2/3}/\delta$ as z becomes large, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |\partial_z^k \tilde{G}(x, z) f(x)| dx &\leq C\delta^{-k} \int_0^\infty (1 + z)^{(4-k)/3} e^{-\eta x} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{|Z|} |X-Z|} dx \\ &\leq C\delta^{-k} (1 + z)^{1-k/3} e^{-\eta z} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{|Z|} |X-Z|} \delta dX \\ &\leq C\delta^{1-k} (1 + z) e^{-\eta|z|} \end{aligned}$$

Here again we have used the change of variable $dx = \delta \dot{z}^{-1} dX$ with $\dot{z} \approx (1 + |x|)^{1/3}$.

Let us now consider the nonlocal term $E(x, z)$, which is nonzero for $x > z$, and consider the case $z \geq 1$. We recall that

$$|E(x, z)| \leq C(1 + x)^{4/3} (1 + |X|)^{-3/2} + C(1 + x)^{1/3} |x - z|.$$

Let us give estimate on the integrals involving the last term in $E(x, z)$; the first term in $E(x, z)$ can be treated easily. We consider two cases: $|x - z| \leq M$ and $|x - z| \geq M$ for

$M = \frac{1}{\eta} \log(1+z)$. In the former case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_z^{z+M} |E(x, z)f(x)|dx &\leq CM \int_z^{z+M} (1+x)^{1/3} e^{-\eta|x|} dx \\ &\leq C(1+z)^{1/3} \log(1+z) e^{-\eta|z|}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $x > z + M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z+M}^{\infty} |E(x, z)f(x)|dx &\leq C \int_{z+M}^{\infty} (1+x)^{4/3} e^{-\eta|x|} dx \\ &\leq C(1+z)^{4/3} e^{-\eta M} e^{-\eta|z|} = C(1+z)^{1/3} e^{-\eta|z|}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Similarly, we also obtain the following convolution estimate for the error kernel $Err_A(x, z)$.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $Err_A(x, z)$ be the error kernel of the primitive Airy equation defined as in Lemma 4.8, and let $f \in X_\eta$ for some $\eta > 0$. Then there is some constant C so that*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty Err_A(x, \cdot) f(x) dx \right\|_\eta \leq C\delta \|f\|_\eta \quad (4.38)$$

for all $z \geq 0$.

Proof. Again, we assume $\|f\|_\eta = 1$. From the estimates in Lemma 4.10, we in particular have $|Err_A(x, z)| \leq C\delta$. Thus, the estimate is clear when $|z| \leq 1$. Let us consider the case $z \geq 1$. Similarly to the estimate on $\tilde{G}(x, z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |Err_A(x, z)f(x)|dx &\leq C\delta \int_0^\infty (1+z)^{-4/3} e^{-\eta x} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} dx \\ &\leq C\delta e^{-\eta z} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} \delta dX \\ &\leq C\delta^2 e^{-\eta z}. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma thus follows. $\square$

4.6 Resolution of modified Airy equation

In this section, we shall introduce the approximate inverse of the *Airy* operator. We recall that $Airy(\phi) = \varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi - (U - c + 2\varepsilon\alpha^2) \partial_z^2 \phi$. Let us study the inhomogeneous Airy equation

$$Airy(\phi) = f(z), \quad (4.39)$$

for some source $f(z)$. We introduce the approximate solution to this equation by defining

$$AirySolver(f) := \int_0^{+\infty} G(x, z) f(x) dx. \quad (4.40)$$

Then, since the Green function $G(x, z)$ does not solve exactly the modified Airy equation (see (4.30)), the solution $AirySolver(f)$ does not solve it exactly either. However, there holds

$$Airy(AirySolver(f)) = f + AiryErr(f) \quad (4.41)$$

where the error operator $AiryErr(\cdot)$ is defined by

$$AiryErr(f) := \int_0^{+\infty} Err_A(x, z) f(x) dx,$$

in which $Err_A(x, z)$ is the error kernel of the Airy operator, defined as in Lemma 4.8. In particular, from Lemma 4.12, we have the estimate

$$\|AiryErr(f)\|_\eta \leq C\delta \|f\|_\eta, \quad (4.42)$$

for all $f \in X_\eta$. That is, $AiryErr(f)$ is indeed of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ in X_η .

For the above mentioned reason, we may now define by iteration an exact solver for the modified Airy operator. Let us start with a fixed $f \in X_\eta$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n &= -AirySolver(E_{n-1}) \\ E_n &= -AiryErr(E_{n-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, with $E_0 = f$. Let us also denote

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k.$$

It follows by induction that

$$Airy(S_n) = f + E_n,$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Now by (4.42), we have

$$\|E_n\|_\eta \leq C\delta \|E_{n-1}\|_\eta \leq (C\delta)^n \|f\|_\eta.$$

This proves that $E_n \rightarrow 0$ in X_η as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since δ is small. In addition, by a view of Lemma 4.11, we have

$$\|\phi_n\|_{\eta'} \leq C \|E_{n-1}\|_\eta \leq C(C\delta)^{n-1}.$$

This shows that ϕ_n converges to zero in $X_{\eta'}$ for arbitrary fixed $\eta' < \eta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and furthermore the series

$$S_n \rightarrow S_\infty$$

in $X_{\eta'}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some $S_\infty \in X_{\eta'}$. We then denote $AirySolver_\infty(f) = S_\infty$, for each $f \in X_\eta$. In addition, we have $Airy(S_\infty) = f$, that is, $AirySolver_\infty(f)$ is the exact solver for the modified Airy operator.

To summarize, we have proved the following proposition.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\eta' < \eta$ be positive numbers. Assume that δ is sufficiently small. There exists an exact solver $\text{AirySolver}_\infty(\cdot)$ as a well-defined operator from X_η to $X_{\eta'}$ so that*

$$\text{Airy}(\text{AirySolver}_\infty(f)) = f.$$

In addition, there holds

$$\|\text{AirySolver}_\infty(f)\|_{\eta'} \leq \frac{C}{\eta - \eta'} \|f\|_\eta,$$

for some positive constant C .

5 Singularities and Airy equations

In this section, we study the smoothing effect of the modified Airy function. Precisely, let us consider the Airy equation with a singular source:

$$\text{Airy}(\phi) = \varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi - (U - c) \partial_z^2 \phi = \epsilon \partial_z^4 f(z) \quad (5.1)$$

in which $f \in Y_4^\eta$, that is $f(z)$ satisfies

$$|\partial_z^k f(z)| \leq C e^{-\eta z}, \quad k = 0, \dots, 4, \quad (5.2)$$

for z away from z_c , and $f(z)$ behaves as $(z - z_c) \log(z - z_c)$ for z near z_c . Precisely, we assume that

$$|f(z)| \leq C, \quad |\partial_z f(z)| \leq C(1 + |\log(z - z_c)|), \quad |\partial_z^k f(z)| \leq C(1 + |z - z_c|^{1-k}), \quad (5.3)$$

for z near z_c and for $k = 2, 3, 4$, for some constant C .

We are interested in the convolution of the Green function of the Airy equation against the most singular term $\partial_z^4 f(z)$, or precisely the inverse of the Airy operator smoothing the singularities in the source term $\epsilon \partial_z^4 f$.

We then obtain the following crucial proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that $z_c, \delta \lesssim \alpha$. Let $\text{AirySolver}_\infty(\cdot)$ be the exact Airy solver of the $\text{Airy}(\cdot)$ operator constructed as in Proposition 4.13 and let $f \in Y_4^\eta$. There holds the estimate:*

$$\left\| \text{AirySolver}_\infty(\epsilon \partial_x^4 f) \right\|_{X_2^{\eta'}} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\eta - \eta'}} \|f\|_{Y_4^\eta} \delta (1 + |\log \delta|) (1 + |z_c/\delta|) \quad (5.4)$$

for arbitrary $\eta' < \eta$.

We start the proof of the proposition by obtaining the same estimate for $\text{AirySolver}(\epsilon \partial_z^4 f)$ and $\text{AiryError}(\epsilon \partial_z^4 f)$. The claimed estimate for the exact solver follows the same lines as those given in Section 4.6. It thus suffices to prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $z_c, \delta \lesssim \alpha$. Let $G(x, z)$ be the approximated Green function to the modified Airy equation constructed as in Lemma 4.8 and let $f \in Y_4^\eta$. There holds a convolution estimate:*

$$\left| (U(z) - c)^k \partial_z^k \int_0^\infty G(x, z) \epsilon \partial_x^4 f(x) dx \right| \leq C \|f\|_{Y_4^\eta} \delta (1 + |\log \delta|) (1 + |z_c/\delta| + \delta^{1/2} |z|^{1/3}) e^{-\eta z} \quad (5.5)$$

for all $z \geq 0$, and for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

Similarly, we also have the following.

Lemma 5.3. Assume that $z_c, \delta \lesssim \alpha$. Let $Err_A(x, z)$ be the error defined as in Lemma 4.8 and let $f \in Y_4^\eta$. There holds the convolution estimate for $Err_A(x, z)$

$$\left| (U(z) - c)^k \partial_z^k \int_0^\infty Err_A(x, z) \epsilon \partial_x^4 f(x) dx \right| \leq C \|f\|_{Y_4^\eta} e^{-\eta z} \delta^2 (1 + |\log \delta|) \quad (5.6)$$

for all $z \geq 0$, and for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2 with $k = 0$. Let us assume that $\|f\|_{Y_4^\eta} = 1$. To begin our estimates, let us recall the decomposition of $G(x, z)$ into the localized and non-localized part as

$$G(x, z) = \tilde{G}(x, z) + E(x, z),$$

where $\tilde{G}(x, z)$ and $E(x, z)$ satisfy the pointwise bounds in Lemma 4.9. In addition, we recall that $\epsilon \partial_x^j G_{2,a}(X, Z)$ and so $\epsilon \partial_x^j G(x, z)$ are continuous across $x = z$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$. Using the continuity, we can integrate by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(z) &= -\epsilon \int_0^\infty \partial_x^3 (\tilde{G} + E)(x, z) \partial_x f(x) dx + \mathcal{B}_0(z) \\ &= I_\ell(z) + I_e(z) + \mathcal{B}_0(z) \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Here, $I_\ell(z)$ and $I_e(z)$ denote the corresponding integral that involves $\tilde{G}(x, z)$ and $E(x, z)$ respectively, and $\mathcal{B}_0(z)$ is introduced to collect the boundary terms at $x = 0$ and is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_0(z) := -\epsilon \sum_{k=0}^2 (-1)^k \partial_x^k G(x, z) \partial_x^{3-k} (f(x))|_{x=0}. \quad (5.8)$$

By a view of the definition of $E(x, z)$, we further denote

$$\begin{aligned} I_{e,1}(z) &:= i\delta^2 \pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^3 (\dot{x}^{3/2} a_1(x)(z-x)) \partial_x f(x) dx, \\ I_{e,2}(z) &:= i\delta^3 \pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^3 (\dot{x}^{3/2} a_2(x)) \partial_x f(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

We have $I_e(z) = I_{e,1}(z) + I_{e,2}(z)$.

Estimate for the integral $I_\ell(z)$. Using the bound (4.32) on the localized part of the Green function, we can give bounds on the integral term I_ℓ in (5.7). Consider the case $|z - z_c| \leq \delta$. In this case, we note that $\eta'(z) \approx \dot{z}(\eta(z)) \approx 1$. By splitting the integral into two cases according to the estimate (4.32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_\ell(z)| &= \left| \epsilon \int_0^\infty \partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} |\partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)| dx + \epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} |\partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)| dx, \end{aligned}$$

in which since $\epsilon \partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z)$ is uniformly bounded, the first integral on the right is bounded by

$$C \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} |\partial_x f(x)| dx \leq C \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|).$$

For the second integral on the right, we note that in this case since X and Z are away from each other, there holds $e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} \leq Ce^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}}e^{-\frac{1}{6}|Z|^{3/2}}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} |\partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)| dx &\leq C \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} e^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}} e^{-\eta x} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \\ &\leq C(1 + |\log \delta|) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}} dx \\ &\leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|), \end{aligned}$$

in which the second-to-last inequality was due to the crucial change of variable $X = \delta^{-1}\eta(x)$ and so $dx = \delta \dot{z}(\eta(x)) dX$ with $|\dot{z}(\eta(x))| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{1/3}$.

Let us now consider the case $|z - z_c| \geq \delta$. Here we note that as $z \rightarrow \infty$, $Z = \delta^{-1}\eta(z)$ also tends to infinity since $|\eta(z)| \approx (1 + |z|)^{2/3}$ as z is sufficiently large. We again split the integral in x into two parts $|x - z_c| \leq \delta$ and $|x - z_c| \geq \delta$. For the integral over $\{|x - z_c| \leq \delta\}$, as above, with X and Z being away from each other, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} |\partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)| dx &\leq Ce^{-\frac{1}{6}|Z|^{3/2}} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \\ &\leq Ce^{-\eta z} \delta(1 + |\log \delta|). \end{aligned}$$

Here the exponential decay in z was due to the decay term $e^{-\frac{1}{6}|Z|^{3/2}}$ with $Z \approx (1 + z)^{2/3}$. Next, for the integral over $\{|x - z_c| \geq \delta\}$, we use the bound (4.32) and the assumption $|\partial_x f(x)| \leq Ce^{-\eta x}(1 + |\log \delta|)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} |\partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)| dx &\leq C(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + z)^{1/3} \int e^{-\eta x} e^{-\sqrt{2|Z|}|X-Z|/3} dx \\ &\leq C(1 + |\log \delta|)\delta(1 + z)^{1/3} e^{-\eta z} |Z|^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

If $z \leq 1$, the above is clearly bounded by $C(1 + |\log \delta|)\delta$. Consider the case $z \geq 1$. We note that $|Z| \gtrsim |z|^{2/3}/\delta$. This implies that $(1 + z)^{1/3}|Z|^{-1/2} \lesssim 1$ and so the above integral is again bounded by $C(1 + |\log \delta|)\delta e^{-\eta z}$.

Therefore in all cases, we have $|I_\ell(z)| \leq Ce^{-\eta z}\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)$ or equivalently,

$$\left| \int_0^\infty \epsilon \partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x) dx \right| \leq Ce^{-\eta z}\delta(1 + |\log \delta|) \quad (5.9)$$

for all $z \geq 0$.

Estimate for $I_{e,2}$. Again, we consider several cases depending on the size of z . For z away from the critical and boundary layer (and so is x): $z \geq |z_c| + \delta$, we apply integration by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{e,2}(z) &= i\delta^3\pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x f(x) dx \\ &= -i\delta^3\pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x^2 f(x) dx - i\delta^3\pi \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x f(x)|_{x=z}. \end{aligned}$$

Here for convenience, we recall the bound (4.34) on $a_2(x)$:

$$|\partial_x^k a_2(x)| \leq C\delta^{-k}(1+x)^{5/6-k/3}(1+|X|)^{k/2-3/2}. \quad (5.10)$$

Now by using this bound and the fact that $|Z| \gtrsim |z|^{2/3}/\delta$, the boundary term is clearly bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C\delta(1+|z|)^{2/3}(1+|Z|)^{-1/2}(1+|\log(z-z_c)|)e^{-\eta z} \\ \leq Ce^{-\eta z}\delta(1+|\log \delta|)(1+\delta^{1/2}|z|^{1/3}) \end{aligned}$$

whereas the integral term is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \delta^3\pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x^2 f(x) dx \right| \\ \leq C\delta \int_z^\infty (1+x)^{2/3}|X|^{-1/2}|x-z_c|^{-1}e^{-\eta x} dx \\ \leq C\delta(1+z)^{2/3}|Z|^{-1/2}e^{-\eta z}(1+|\log \delta|) \\ \leq C\delta(1+|\log \delta|)(1+\delta^{1/2}|z|^{1/3})e^{-\eta z}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\left| I_{e,2}(z) \right| \leq C\delta(1+|\log \delta|)(1+\delta^{1/2}|z|^{1/3})e^{-\eta z}, \quad (5.11)$$

for all $z \geq |z_c| + \delta$.

Next, for $z \leq |z_c| + \delta$, we write the integral $I_{e,2}(z)$ into

$$\delta^3 \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x f(x) dx + \delta^3 \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(x))\partial_x f(x) dx,$$

where the first integral can be estimated similarly as done in (5.11). For the last integral, using (5.10) for bounded X yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \delta^3 \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_2(X))\partial_x f(x) dx \right| &\leq C \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (1+|\log(x-z_c)|) dx \\ &\leq C\delta(1+|\log \delta|). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$\left| I_{e,2}(z) \right| \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + \delta^{1/2}|z|^{1/3})e^{-\eta z}, \quad (5.12)$$

for all $z \geq 0$.

Estimate for $I_{e,1}$. Following the above estimates, we can now consider the integral

$$I_{e,1}(z) = i\delta^2\pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x f(x) dx,$$

Let us recall the bound (4.34) on $a_1(x)$:

$$|\partial_x^k a_1(x)| \leq C\delta^{-k}(1+x)^{1/2-k/3}(1+|X|)^{k/2-1}. \quad (5.13)$$

To estimate the integral $I_{e,1}(z)$, we again divide the integral into several cases. First, consider the case $z \geq |z_c| + \delta$. Since in this case x is away from the critical layer, we can apply integration by parts three times to get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{e,1}(z) &= -i\delta^2\pi \int_z^\infty \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x^2 f(x) dx - i\delta^2\pi \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x f(x)|_{x=z} \\ &= -i\delta^2\pi \int_z^\infty \dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x)\partial_x^4 f(x) dx \\ &\quad + i\delta^2\pi \left(\partial_x(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x^2 f(x) - \partial_x^2(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x f(x) \right)|_{x=z} \end{aligned}$$

in which the boundary terms are bounded by $e^{-\eta|z|}\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)$ times

$$\begin{aligned} (1+z)^{1/6} &\left[\delta(1+z)^{5/6}|Z|^{-1}|z-z_c|^{-1} + \delta(1+z)^{-1/6}|Z|^{-1} + (1+z)^{1/2}|Z|^{-1/2} \right] \\ &\leq C(1 + \delta^{1/2}z^{1/3}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we consider the integral term in $I_{e,1}$. Let $M = \frac{1}{\eta} \log(1+z)$. By (5.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \delta^2\pi \int_z^\infty \dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x)\partial_x^4 f(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq C \int_z^\infty \delta^2(1+x)(1+|X|)^{-1}|x-z||x-z_c|^{-3}e^{-\eta x} dx \\ &\leq C(1+z)^{1/3} \left[M + (1+z)e^{-\eta M} \right] e^{-\eta z} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} \delta^3|x-z_c|^{-3} dx \\ &\leq C(1+z)^{1/3} \log(1+z)e^{-\eta z}\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain the desired uniform bound $I_{e,1}(z)$ for $z \geq |z_c| + \delta$.

Next, consider the case $|z - z_c| \leq \delta$ in which Z is bounded. We write

$$I_{e,1}(z) = i\delta^2\pi \left[\int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} + \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} \right] \partial_x^3(\dot{x}^{3/2}a_1(x)(z-x))\partial_x f(x) dx.$$

The first integral on the right can be estimated similarly as above, using integration by parts. For the second integral, we use the bound (5.13) for bounded X to get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \delta^2 \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} \partial_x^3 (\dot{x}^{3/2} a_1(x)(z-x)) \partial_x f(x) dx \right| &\leq C \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (1 + |\log(x-z_c)|) dx \\ &\leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider the case $0 \leq z \leq |z_c| - \delta$. This is the case when $\delta \ll |z_c|$, that is the critical layer is away from the boundary layer. In this case the linear growth in Z becomes significant: $|Z| \lesssim (1 + |z_c|/\delta)$. Thus, following the above analysis, we obtain

$$I_{e,1}(z) \leq C(1 + |z_c/\delta|)\delta(1 + |\log \delta|). \quad (5.14)$$

The estimate for $I_{e,1}(z)$ thus follows for all $z \geq 0$.

Estimate for the boundary term $\mathcal{B}_0(z)$. It remains to give estimates on

$$\mathcal{B}_0(z) = -\epsilon \sum_{k=0}^2 (-1)^k \partial_x^k G(x, z) \partial_x^{3-k} (f(x))|_{x=0}.$$

We note that there is no linear term $E(x, z)$ at the boundary $x = 0$ since $z \geq 0$. Using the bound (4.32) for $x = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\epsilon \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x^3 (f(x))|_{x=0} &\leq C\delta^3 (1 + |z_c|^{-2}) e^{-\frac{2}{3}|Z|^{3/2}} \\ |\epsilon \partial_x \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x^2 (f(x))|_{x=0} &\leq C\delta^2 (1 + |z_c|^{-1}) e^{-\frac{2}{3}|Z|^{3/2}} \\ |\epsilon \partial_x^2 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x)|_{x=0} &\leq C\delta (1 + |\log z_c|) e^{-\frac{2}{3}|Z|^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with the assumption that $\delta \lesssim z_c$ then yields

$$|\mathcal{B}_0(z)| \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|) e^{-\eta z}. \quad (5.15)$$

Combining all the estimates above yields the lemma for $k = 0$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.2 with $k > 0$. We now prove the lemma for the case $k = 2$; the case $k = 1$ follows similarly. We consider the integral

$$\epsilon \int_0^\infty (U(z) - c)^2 \partial_z^2 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x^4 f(x) dx = I_1(z) + I_2(z),$$

with $I_1(z)$ and $I_2(z)$ denoting the integration over $\{|x - z_c| \leq \delta\}$ and $\{|x - z_c| \geq \delta\}$, respectively. Note that $(U(z) - c)\dot{z}^2 = U'(z_c)\eta(z)$ and recall that $Z = \eta(z)/\delta$ by definition. For the second integral $I_2(z)$, by using (5.2), (5.3), and the bounds on the Green function for x away from z and for x near z , it follows easily that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2(z)| &\leq C \left[\delta e^{-\eta z} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} (1 + |Z|)^{1/2} e^{-\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} (1 + |x - z_c|^{-1}) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \epsilon e^{-\frac{1}{6}|Z|^{3/2}} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \geq \delta\}} e^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}} (1 + |x - z_c|^{-3}) e^{-\eta x} dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using $|x - z_c| \geq \delta$ in these integrals and making a change of variable $X = \eta(x)/\delta$ to gain an extra factor of δ , we obtain

$$|I_2(z)| \leq C\delta \left[(1+z)e^{-\eta z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1+|Z|)^{1/2} e^{-\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} dX + e^{-\frac{1}{8}|Z|^{3/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}} dX \right],$$

which is clearly bounded by $C\delta(1+z)e^{-\eta z}$. It remains to give the estimate on $I_1(z)$ over the region: $|x - z_c| \leq \delta$. In this case, we take integration by parts three times. Leaving the boundary terms untreated for a moment, let us consider the integral term

$$\epsilon \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (U(z) - c)^2 \partial_z^2 \partial_x^3 \tilde{G}(x, z) \partial_x f(x) dx.$$

We note that the twice z -derivative causes a large factor δ^{-2} which combines with $(U - c)^2$ to give a term of order $|Z|^2$. Similarly, the small factor of ϵ cancels out with δ^{-3} that comes from the third x -derivative. The integral is therefore easily bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & C \left[e^{-\eta z} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} e^{-\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{|Z|}|X-Z|} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \right. \\ & \quad \left. + e^{-\frac{1}{6}|Z|^{3/2}} \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} e^{-\frac{1}{6}|X|^{3/2}} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \right] \\ & \leq C \left[e^{-\eta z} + e^{-\frac{1}{8}|Z|^{3/2}} \right] \int_{\{|x-z_c| \leq \delta\}} (1 + |\log(x - z_c)|) dx \\ & \leq C e^{-\eta z} \delta (1 + |\log \text{Im } c|). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the boundary terms can be treated, following the above analysis and that done in the case $k = 0$; see (5.15). This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.3 . The proof follows similarly, but more straightforwardly, the above proof for the localized part of the Green function, upon recalling that

$$Err_A(x, z) = \epsilon(\partial_z^2 \dot{z}^{1/2} \dot{z}^{-1/2} - 2\alpha^2) \partial_z^2 G(x, z).$$

We skip the details. $\square$

6 Construction of slow Orr-Sommerfeld modes

In this section, we iteratively construct two exact slow-decaying and -growing solutions $\phi_{1,2}$. Precisely, we obtain the following proposition whose proof will be given at the end of the section, yielding an exact solution to the Orr-Sommerfeld equations, starting from the exact solution to the Rayleigh equation.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\phi_{Ray} \in X_\alpha$ be an exact solution to the Rayleigh equation: $Ray_\alpha(\phi_{Ray}) = f$, with $f \in X_\eta$, for $\eta > 0$. For sufficiently small α, ϵ , there exists an exact solution $\phi_s(z)$ in X_α which solves the Orr-Sommerfeld equations*

$$Orr(\phi_s) = f,$$

so that ϕ_s is close to ϕ_{Ray} in X_2^η . Precisely, we have

$$\|\phi_s - \phi_{Ray}\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|),$$

for some positive constant C independent of α, ϵ .

For instance, if we start our construction with the exact Rayleigh solutions $\phi_{Ray, \pm}$, which were constructed from Lemma 3.6. Proposition 6.1 yields existence of two exact solutions $\phi_{s, \pm}$ to the homogenous Orr-Sommerfeld equation.

Next, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *The slow modes ϕ_s constructed in Proposition 6.1 depend analytically in c , for $\text{Im } c > 0$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward since the only “singularities” are of the forms: $\log(U-c)$, $1/(U-c)$, $1/(U-c)^2$, and $1/(U-c)^3$, which are of course analytic in c when $\text{Im } c > 0$. $\square$

Remark 6.3. It can be shown that the approximated solution ϕ_N can be extended C^γ -Hölder continuously on the axis $\{\text{Im } c = 0\}$, for $0 \leq \gamma < 1$.

6.1 Principle of the construction

The proof of Proposition 6.1 follows at once from the following proposition, providing approximate solutions to the Orr-Sommerfeld equations.

Proposition 6.4. *Let N be arbitrarily large. Under the same assumptions of Proposition 6.1, there exists a function $\phi_N \in X_\alpha$ such that ϕ_N approximately solves the Orr-Sommerfeld equation in the sense that*

$$Orr(\phi_N)(z) = f + O_N(z), \tag{6.1}$$

with the error $O_N(z)$ satisfying

$$\|O_N\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq \left[C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|) \right]^N.$$

As already discussed in the introduction, we start from the Rayleigh solution ϕ_{Ray} so that

$$Ray_\alpha(\phi_{Ray}) = f.$$

By definition, we have

$$Orr(\phi_{Ray}) = f - Diff(\phi_{Ray}). \quad (6.2)$$

Next, we introduce

$$A_s := \chi Diff(\phi_{Ray}), \quad I_0 := (1 - \chi) Diff(\phi_{Ray})$$

in which $\chi(z)$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi = 1$ on $[0, 1]$ and zero on $[2, \infty)$. We also let

$$B_s := AirySolver_\infty(A_s), \quad J_0 := \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_0)(z)$$

in which $\partial_z^{-1} = -\int_z^\infty$. We then define

$$\phi_1 := \phi_{Ray} + B_s + J_0. \quad (6.3)$$

We note that by the identities (2.6), $Airy(J_0) = \mathcal{A}_a(\partial_z^2 J_0)$, and the fact that $\partial_z^2 J_0 = \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_0)$, there hold

$$\begin{aligned} Orr(B_s) &= A_s + Reg(AirySolver_\infty(A_s)) \\ Orr(J_0) &= I_0 + Reg(J_0). \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together with (6.2), we get

$$Orr(\phi_1) = f + O_1, \quad O_1 := Reg(AirySolver_\infty(A_s)) + Reg(J_0),$$

with $Reg(\phi) := -(\varepsilon\alpha^4 + U'' + \alpha^2(U - c))\phi$.

Inductively, let us assume that we have constructed ϕ_N so that

$$Orr(\phi_N) = f + O_N,$$

with an error O_N which is sufficiently small in X_η . We then improve the error term by constructing a new approximate solution $\phi_{1,N+1}$ so that it solves the Orr-Sommerfeld equations with a better error in X_η . To do so, we first solve the Rayleigh equation by introducing

$$\psi_N := -RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(O_N).$$

Observe that by a view of (2.6) and (3.2)

$$Orr(\phi_N + \psi_N) = f - Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(O_N)). \quad (6.4)$$

As in the previous step, we introduce

$$A_{s,N} := \chi Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(O_N)), \quad I_N := (1 - \chi) Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(O_N))$$

in which $\chi(z)$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi = 1$ on $[0, 1]$ and zero on $[2, \infty)$. We also let

$$B_{s,N} := \text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_{s,N}), \quad J_N := \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_N)(z)$$

in which $\partial_z^{-1} = -\int_z^\infty$. We then define

$$\phi_{1,N+1} := \phi_N + \psi_N + B_{s,N} + J_N. \quad (6.5)$$

We note that by the identities (2.6), $\text{Airy}(J_N) = \mathcal{A}_a(\partial_z^2 J_N)$, and the fact that $\partial_z^2 J_N = \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_N)$, there hold

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Orr}(B_{s,N}) &= A_{s,N} + \text{Reg}(\text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_{s,N})) \\ \text{Orr}(J_N) &= I_N + \text{Reg}(J_N). \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together with (6.4), we get

$$\text{Orr}(\phi_{1,N+1}) = f + \text{Reg}(\text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_{s,N})) + \text{Reg}(J_N).$$

with $\text{Reg}(\phi) := -(\varepsilon\alpha^4 + U'' + \alpha^2(U - c))\phi$. To ensure the convergence, let us introduce the iterating operator

$$\text{Iter}(g) := \text{Reg}(\text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_s(g))) + \text{Reg}(\partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I(g))) \quad (6.6)$$

in which $A_s(g) := \chi \text{Diff}(\text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g))$ and $I(g) := (1 - \chi) \text{Diff}(\text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g))$. Then

$$\text{Orr}(\phi_{N+1}) = f + O_{N+1}, \quad O_{N+1} := \text{Iter}(O_N).$$

We then inductively iterate this procedure to get an accurate approximation to ϕ_1 . We shall prove the following key lemma which gives sufficient estimates on the *Iter* operator and would therefore complete the proof of Proposition 6.4.

Lemma 6.5. *For $g \in X_2^\eta$, the $\text{Iter}(\cdot)$ operator defined as in (6.6) is a well-defined map from X_2^η to X_2^η . Furthermore, there holds*

$$\|\text{Iter}(g)\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|)\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}, \quad (6.7)$$

for some universal constant C .

Proof. Let $g \in X_2^\eta$. We give estimates on each term in $\text{Iter}(f)$. We recall that $\text{Diff}(h) = -\varepsilon(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2 h$. In addition, from the identity $\text{Ray}_\alpha(\text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g)) = g$, we have

$$(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2) \text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g) = \frac{U'' \text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g)}{U - c} + \frac{g}{U - c}.$$

Thus, by a view of Proposition 3.1 and the fact that U'' decays exponentially, we have

$$|(\partial_z^2 - \alpha^2)^2 \text{RaySolver}_{\alpha,\infty}(g)(z)| \leq C e^{-\eta z} \|g\|_{X_2^\eta},$$

for all $z \geq 1$. We note that since we consider $z \geq 1$, there is no singularity coming from the critical layer: $U(z_c) = c$. We note also that that on the right hand side, the derivatives of f appear at most at the second order. This proves

$$\|I(g)\|_\eta = \|(1 - \chi)Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(g))\|_\eta \leq C\epsilon\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}.$$

with $I(g) = (1 - \chi)Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(g))$ as defined in the $Iter(\cdot)$ operator.

Now, by Proposition 4.7, we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I(g))\|_\eta \leq C\delta^{-1}\|I(g)\|_\eta \leq C\delta^2\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}.$$

Clearly, for $g \in X_\eta$, we have $\|\partial_z^{-1}g\|_\eta \leq C\|g\|_\eta$. This yields

$$\|\partial_z^{-2}\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I(g))\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq C\delta\|g\|_{X_2^\eta},$$

which proves at once

$$\|\partial_z^{-2}\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I(g))\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq C\delta^2\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}. \quad (6.8)$$

We remark that there is no loss of derivatives in the above estimate.

$$AirySolver_\infty(A_s(g))$$

Next, it remains to give estimates for the terms involving the critical layer. We recall that

$$A_s(g) = \chi Diff(RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(g)),$$

which clearly belongs to $X_{\eta_1,4}$, for arbitrary $\eta_1 > 0$. The reason for this is precisely due to the cut-off function χ which vanishes identically for $z \geq 2$. The singularity is up to order $(z - z_c)^{-3}$ due to the $z \log z$ singularity in $RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(\cdot)$.

By a view of Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\|\chi(z)RaySolver_{\alpha,\infty}(g)\|_{Y_4^{\eta_1}} \leq C\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}. \quad (6.9)$$

In addition, by applying Proposition 5.1, we get

$$\left\| AirySolver_\infty(\chi Diff(h)) \right\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\eta_1 - \eta}} \|h\|_{Y_4^{\eta_1}} \delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|).$$

By taking $\eta_1 = 1 + \eta$, this together with (6.9) yields

$$\left\| AirySolver_\infty(A_s(g)) \right\|_{X_2^\eta} \leq C\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|)\|g\|_{X_2^\eta}. \quad (6.10)$$

It is now straightforward to conclude Lemma 6.5 simply by combining (6.8) and (6.10), upon recalling that $Reg(\phi) := -(\varepsilon\alpha^4 + U'' + \alpha^2(U - c))\phi$. $\square$

6.2 First order expansion of the slow-decaying mode ϕ_s

In this paragraph we explicitly compute the boundary contribution of the first terms in the expansion of the slow Orr-Sommerfeld modes. We recall that the leading term from (6.3) reads

$$\phi_1(z; c) = \phi_{Ray}(z; c) + \text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_s)(z) + \partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_0)(z) \quad (6.11)$$

in which $A_s := \chi \text{Diff}(\phi_{Ray})$, $I_0 := (1 - \chi) \text{Diff}(\phi_{Ray})$, and $\phi_{Ray}(z; c) = \phi_{Ray,-}(z)$ as constructed from Lemma 3.6. There, we recall that

$$\phi_{Ray,-}(z) = e^{-\alpha z}(U - c + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)).$$

Thus, together with Proposition 4.7,

$$\|\partial_z^{-2} \mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_0)\|_\eta \leq C \|\mathcal{A}_{a,\infty}^{-1}(I_0)\|_\eta \leq C \delta^{-1} \|I_0\|_\eta \leq C \delta^2.$$

Next, with $A_s = \chi \text{Diff}(\phi_{Ray})$, we can write

$$A_s = \chi \text{Diff}(e^{-\alpha z}(U - c)) + \chi \text{Diff}(\mathcal{O}(\alpha)),$$

in which the first term consists of no singularity, and of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. We only need to apply the smoothing-singularity lemma to the last term in A_s . Propositions 5.1 and 4.13 thus yield

$$\|\text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_s)\|_\eta \leq C\epsilon + C\alpha\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|).$$

This proves that

$$\|\phi_1(\cdot; c) - \phi_{Ray,-}\|_\eta \leq C\delta^2 + C\alpha\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|). \quad (6.12)$$

In this section, we will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let ϕ_1 be defined as in (6.11), and let $U'_0 \neq 0$. For small z_c, α, δ , such that $\delta \lesssim \alpha$ and $z_c \approx \alpha$, there hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi_1(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_1(0; c)} &= \frac{1}{U'_0} \left[U_0 - c + \alpha \frac{(U_+ - U_0)^2}{U'_0} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 \log \alpha) \right], \\ \text{Im} \frac{\phi_1(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_1(0; c)} &= \frac{-\text{Im } c}{U'_0} \left[1 + 2\alpha \frac{U_+ - U_0}{U'_0} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 \log \alpha) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha) \delta |\log \delta| (1 + |z_c/\delta|). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Here, $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ is to denote the bound in L^∞ norm.

The proof of the lemma follows directly from Lemma 3.6, together with the estimate (6.12). Indeed, let us recall

$$\phi_{Ray,-}(0) = U_0 - c + \alpha(U_+ - U_0)^2 \phi_{2,0}(0) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha(\alpha + |z_c|))$$

and $\partial_z \phi_{Ray,-}(0) = U'_0 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha \log z_c)$.

7 Construction of fast Orr-Sommerfeld modes ϕ_f

In this section we provide a similar construction to that obtained in Proposition 6.4. The construction will begin with the fast decaying solution that links with Airy solutions:

$$\phi_{3,0}(z) := \gamma_0 Ai(2, \delta^{-1} \eta(z)), \quad (7.1)$$

where $\gamma_0 = Ai(2, \delta^{-1} \eta(0))^{-1}$ the normalized constant so that $\phi_{3,0}$ is bounded with $\phi_{3,0}(0) = 1$, $Ai(2, \cdot)$ is the second primitive of the Airy solution $Ai(\cdot)$, and

$$\delta = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{U'_c} \right)^{1/3}, \quad \eta(z) = \left[\frac{3}{2} \int_{z_c}^z \left(\frac{U-c}{U'_c} \right)^{1/2} dz \right]^{2/3}. \quad (7.2)$$

We recall that as Z tends to infinities, $Ai(2, e^{i\pi/6} Z)$ asymptotically behaves as $e^{\mp \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} |Z|^{3/2}}$. Here $Z = \eta(z)/\delta \approx (1+z)^{2/3}/\delta$. This shows that $Ai(2, e^{i\pi/6} Z)$ is asymptotically of order $e^{\pm |z|/\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$ as expected for fast-decaying modes. Consequently, $\phi_{3,0}(z)$ is well-defined for $z \geq 0$ and decays exponentially at $z = \infty$. Let us recall that the critical layer is centered at $z = z_c$ and has a typical size of δ . Inside the critical layer, the Airy function plays a role.

Proposition 7.1. *For α, δ sufficiently small, there is an exact solution $\phi_3(z)$ in $X_{\eta/\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$ solving the Orr-Sommerfeld equation*

$$Orr(\phi_3) = 0$$

so that $\phi_3(z)$ is approximately close to $\phi_{3,0}(z)$ in the sense that

$$|\phi_3(z) - \phi_{3,0}(z)| \leq C \gamma_0 \delta e^{-\eta|z|/\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \quad (7.3)$$

for some fixed constants η, C . In particular, at the boundary $z = 0$,

$$\phi_3(0) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad \partial_z \phi_3(0) = \delta^{-1} \frac{Ai(1, \delta^{-1} \eta(0))}{Ai(2, \delta^{-1} \eta(0))} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)).$$

Remark 7.2. When the critical layer z_c is away from the boundary, that is, z_c/δ is sufficiently large, then the solution $\phi_{3,0}(z)$ behaves as an exponential boundary layer. Indeed, since z is near zero, $\eta(z) \sim z - z_c$, $Z = \eta(z)/\delta \sim (z - z_c)/\delta$, and hence we get

$$Ai(2, \delta^{-1} \eta(z)) \sim |Z|^{-5/4} e^{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} |Z|^{3/2}} \sim |z_c/\delta|^{-5/4} e^{\sqrt{|z_c/\delta|} (z_c - z)/\delta}.$$

Hence, by definition,

$$\phi_{3,0}(z) \sim 1 - e^{-\sqrt{|z_c/\delta|} z/\delta},$$

which is exponential.

From the construction, we also obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 7.3. *The fast-decaying mode ϕ_3 constructed in Proposition 7.1 depends analytically in c with $\text{Im } c \neq 0$.*

Proof. This is simply due to the fact that both Airy function and the Langer transformation (7.2) are analytic in their arguments. $\square$

7.1 Iterative construction of the Airy mode

Let us prove Proposition 7.1 in this section.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. We start with $\phi_{3,0}(z) = \gamma_0 Ai(2, \delta^{-1}\eta(z))$. We note that $\phi_{3,0}$ and $\partial_z \phi_{3,0}$ are both bounded on $z \geq 0$, and so are $\varepsilon \partial_z^4 \phi_{3,0}$ and $(U - c) \partial_z^2 \phi_{3,0}$. We shall show indeed that $\phi_{3,0}$ approximately solves the Orr-Sommerfeld equation. In what follows, let us assume that $\gamma_0 = 1$. Direct calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Airy}(\phi_{3,0}) &:= \varepsilon \delta^{-1} \eta^{(4)} Ai(1, Z) + 4\varepsilon \delta^{-2} \eta' \eta^{(3)} Ai(Z) + 3\varepsilon \delta^{-2} (\eta'')^2 Ai(Z) + \varepsilon \delta^{-4} (\eta')^4 Ai''(Z) \\ &\quad + 6\varepsilon \delta^{-3} \eta'' (\eta')^2 Ai'(Z) - (U - c) \left[\eta'' \delta^{-1} Ai(1, Z) + \delta^{-2} (\eta')^2 Ai(Z) \right], \end{aligned}$$

with $Z = \delta^{-1}\eta(z)$. Let us first look at the leading terms with a factor of $\varepsilon \delta^{-4}$ and of $(U - c) \delta^{-2}$. Using the facts that $\eta' = 1/\dot{z}$, $\delta^3 = \varepsilon/U'_c$, and $(U - c)\dot{z}^2 = U'_c \eta(z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \delta^{-4} (\eta')^4 Ai''(Z) - \delta^{-2} (\eta')^2 (U - c) Ai(Z) \\ &= \varepsilon \delta^{-4} (\eta')^4 \left[Ai''(Z) - \delta^2 \varepsilon^{-2} (U - c) \dot{z}^2 Ai(Z) \right] \\ &= \varepsilon \delta^{-4} (\eta')^4 \left[Ai''(Z) - Z Ai(Z) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The next terms in $\text{Airy}(\phi_{3,0})$ are

$$\begin{aligned} 6\varepsilon \delta^{-3} \eta'' (\eta')^2 Ai'(Z) - (U - c) \eta'' \delta^{-1} Ai(1, Z) \\ &= \left[6\eta'' (\eta')^2 U'_c Ai'(Z) - Z U'_c \eta'' (\eta'^2) Ai(1, Z) \right] \\ &= \eta'' (\eta')^2 U'_c \left[6Ai'(Z) - Z Ai(1, Z) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded for $z \geq 0$. The rest is of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/3})$ or smaller. That is, we obtain

$$\text{Airy}(\phi_{3,0}) = I(z) := \eta'' (\eta')^2 U'_c \left[6Ai'(Z) - Z Ai(1, Z) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/3}).$$

Here we note that the right-hand side $I(z)$ is very localized and depends primarily on the fast variable Z as $Ai(\cdot)$ does. Precisely, we have

$$|I(z)| \leq C(1 + z)^{-2} (1 + |Z|)^{1/4} e^{-\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2}/3} \quad (7.4)$$

for some constant C . Let us then denote

$$\psi(z) := -\text{AirySolver}_\infty(I)(z),$$

the exact Airy solver of $I(z)$. It follows that $\text{Airy}(\phi_{3,0} + \psi) = 0$ and there holds the bound

$$|\psi(z)| \leq C\delta(1 + z)^{-4/3} (1 + |Z|)^{-1/4} e^{-\sqrt{2}|Z|^{3/2}/3}.$$

Next, since $\text{Airy}(\phi_{3,0} + \psi) = 0$, the identity (2.6) yields

$$\text{Orr}(\phi_{3,0} + \psi) = I_1(z) := \text{Reg}(\phi_{3,0} + \psi) = -(\varepsilon\alpha^4 + U'' + \alpha^2(U - c))(\phi_{3,0} + \psi). \quad (7.5)$$

Clearly, $I_1 \in X_\eta$ for some $\eta \approx 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and $I_1 = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, upon recalling that $Z = \eta(z)/\delta \approx (1+z)^{2/3}/\delta$. From this, we can apply the Iter operator constructed previously in Section 6 to improve the error estimate. The proposition thus follows. $\square$

7.2 First order expansion of ϕ_3

By construction in Proposition 7.1, we obtain the following first order expansion of ϕ_3 at the boundary

$$\phi_3(0; c) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad \partial_z \phi_3(0; c) = \delta^{-1} \frac{\text{Ai}(1, \delta^{-1}\eta(0))}{\text{Ai}(2, \delta^{-1}\eta(0))} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)).$$

In the study of the linear dispersion relation, we are interested in the ratio $\partial_z \phi_3 / \phi_3$, on which the above yields

$$\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} = \delta C_{\text{Ai}}(\delta^{-1}\eta(0))(1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)), \quad \text{with } C_{\text{Ai}}(Y) := \frac{\text{Ai}(2, Y)}{\text{Ai}(1, Y)}. \quad (7.6)$$

The following lemma is crucial later on to determine instability.

Lemma 7.4. *Let ϕ_3 be the Orr-Sommerfeld solution constructed in Proposition 7.1. There holds*

$$\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} = -e^{\pi i/4} |\delta| |z_c/\delta|^{-1/2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(|z_c/\delta|^{-3/2})) \quad (7.7)$$

as long as z_c/δ is sufficiently large. In particular, the imaginary part of $\phi_3/\partial_z \phi_3$ becomes negative when z_c/δ is large. In addition, when $z_c/\delta = 0$,

$$\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} = 3^{1/3} \Gamma(4/3) |\delta| e^{5i\pi/6}, \quad (7.8)$$

for $\Gamma(\cdot)$ the usual Gamma function.

Here, we recall that $\delta = e^{-i\pi/6} (\alpha R U'_c)^{-1/3}$, and from the estimate (4.8), $\eta(0) = -z_c + \mathcal{O}(z_c^2)$. Therefore, we are interested in the ratio $C_{\text{Ai}}(Y)$ for complex $Y = -e^{i\pi/6} y$, for y being in a small neighborhood of $\mathbb{R}^+$. Without loss of generality, in what follows, we consider $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Lemma 7.4 follows directly from the following lemma.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $C_{\text{Ai}}(\cdot)$ be defined as above. Then, $C_{\text{Ai}}(\cdot)$ is uniformly bounded on the ray $Y = e^{7i\pi/6} y$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. In addition, there holds*

$$C_{\text{Ai}}(-e^{i\pi/6} y) = -e^{5i\pi/12} y^{-1/2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(y^{-3/2}))$$

for all large $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. At $y = 0$, we have

$$C_{\text{Ai}}(0) = -3^{1/3} \Gamma(4/3).$$

Proof. We notice that $Y = -e^{i\pi/6}y$ belongs to the sector S_1 defined as in Lemma 4.2 for $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Thus, Lemma 4.2 yields

$$C_{Ai}(Y) = -Y^{-1/2}(1 + \mathcal{O}(|Y|^{-3/2}))$$

for large Y . This proves the estimate for large y . The value at $y = 0$ is easily obtained from those of $Ai(k, 0)$ given in Lemma 4.2. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

8 Study of the dispersion relation

8.1 Linear dispersion relation

As mentioned in the Introduction, a solution of (1.9)–(1.11) is a linear combination of the slow-decaying solution ϕ_1 and the fast-decaying solution ϕ_3 . Let us then introduce an exact Orr-Sommerfeld solution of the form

$$\phi := A\phi_1 + B\phi_3, \quad (8.1)$$

for some bounded functions $A = A(\alpha, \epsilon, c)$ and $B = B(\alpha, \epsilon, c)$, where $\phi_1 = \phi_1(z; \alpha, \epsilon, c)$ and $\phi_3 = \phi_3(z; \alpha, \epsilon, c)$ are constructed in Propositions 6.4 and 7.1, respectively. It is clear that $\phi(z)$ is an exact solution to the Orr-Sommerfeld equation, and satisfies the boundary condition (1.11) at $z = +\infty$. The boundary condition (1.10) at $z = 0$ then yields the dispersion relations:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha A(\alpha, \epsilon, c)\phi_1(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c) + \alpha B(\alpha, \epsilon, c)\phi_3(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c) &= 0 \\ A(\alpha, \epsilon, c)\partial_z \phi_1(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c) + B(\alpha, \epsilon, c)\partial_z \phi_3(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c) &= 0 \end{cases}$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{\partial_z \phi_1(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c)}{\phi_1(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c)} = \frac{\partial_z \phi_3(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c)}{\phi_3(0; \alpha, \epsilon, c)}. \quad (8.2)$$

We shall show that for some ranges of (α, ϵ) , the dispersion relation yields the existence of unstable eigenvalues c .

8.2 Ranges of α

When $\epsilon = 0$ our Orr-Sommerfeld equation simply becomes the Rayleigh equation, which was studied in [?] to show that $c(\alpha, 0) = U(0) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and the critical layer $z_c(\alpha, 0) \approx \alpha$ (in the case $U'(0) \neq 0$; similarly, in the case $U'(0) = 0$ with possibly a different rate of convergence). Thus, when $\epsilon > 0$, we expect that $(c(\alpha, \epsilon), z_c(\alpha, \epsilon)) \rightarrow (U(0), 0)$ as $(\alpha, \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ (which will be proved shortly). In addition, as suggested by physical results (see, e.g., [1, 13] or [?] for a summary), and as will be proved below, for instability, we would search for α between $(\alpha_{\text{low}}(R), \alpha_{\text{up}}(R))$ with

$$\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) \approx R^{-1/4}, \quad \alpha_{\text{up}}(R) \approx R^{-1/6},$$

for sufficiently large R . These values of $\alpha_j(R)$ form lower and upper branches of the marginal (in)stability curve for the boundary layer U . More precisely, we will show that there is a critical constant A_{c1} so that with $\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) = A_1 R^{-1/4}$, the imaginary part of c turns from negative (stability) to positive (instability) when the parameter A_1 increases across $A_1 = A_{c1}$. Similarly, there exists an A_{c2} so that with $\alpha = A_2 R^{-1/6}$, $\text{Im } c$ turns from positive to negative as A_2 increases across $A_2 = A_{c2}$. In particular, we obtain instability in the intermediate zone: $\alpha \approx R^{-\beta}$ for $1/6 < \beta < 1/4$.

We note that the ranges of α restrict the absolute value of $\delta = (\varepsilon/U'_c)^{1/3}$ to lie between δ_2 and δ_1 , with $\delta_1 \approx \alpha$ and $\delta_2 \approx \alpha^{5/3}$, respectively. Therefore, in the case $\alpha \approx \alpha_{\text{low}}(R)$, the critical layer is accumulated on the boundary, and thus the fast-decaying mode in the critical layer plays a role of a boundary sublayer; in this case, the mentioned Langer transformation plays a crucial role. In the latter case when $\alpha \approx \alpha_{\text{up}}(R)$, the critical layer is well-separated from the boundary; in this case, it is sufficient to use ϕ_{bl} , and we thus replace ϕ_3 by ϕ_{bl} on the right-hand side of our dispersion relation (8.2).

In the next subsections, we shall prove the following proposition, partially confirming the physical results.

Proposition 8.1. *For R sufficiently large, we show that $\alpha_{\text{low}}(R) = A_1 R^{-1/4}$ is indeed the lower marginal branch for stability and instability. Furthermore, we also obtain instability for intermediate values of $\alpha = AR^{-\beta}$ with $1/6 < \beta < 1/4$. In all cases of instability, there holds*

$$\text{Im } c \approx A^{-1} R^{\beta-1/2}, \quad (8.3)$$

and in particular, we obtain the growth rate

$$\alpha \text{Im } c \approx R^{-1/2}. \quad (8.4)$$

8.3 Expansion of the dispersion relation

We recall that $U'_0 = U'(0) \neq 0$. By calculations from (6.13) and (7.7), the linear dispersion relation (8.2) simply becomes

$$\left[U_0 - c + \frac{\alpha(U_+ - U_0)^2}{U'_0} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 \log \alpha) \right] = \delta C_{Ai}(\delta^{-1} \eta(0))(1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)) \quad (8.5)$$

in which $C_{Ai}(Y) = Ai(2, Y)/Ai(1, Y)$. By Lemma 7.5, $C_{Ai}(\delta^{-1} \eta(0))$ is uniformly bounded, and asymptotically of order $\mathcal{O}(|z_c/\delta|^{-1/2})$ for large z_c/δ . In particular, the right hand side of (8.5) is bounded by $C\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2}$. As a consequence,

$$|U_0 - c| \leq C\alpha + C\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2}. \quad (8.6)$$

Hence as $\alpha, \varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$, the eigenvalue c converges to U_0 and

$$\left| z_c - \frac{\alpha(U_+ - U_0)^2}{U'_0{}^2} \right| \leq C(\alpha^2 \log \alpha + \delta), \quad (8.7)$$

followed by the Taylor's expansion: $c = U(z_c) = U_0 + U'_0 z_c + \mathcal{O}(z_c^2)$.

Next, we give the existence of c for small α, ε .

Lemma 8.2. *For small α, ε , there is a unique $c = c(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ near $c_0 = U_0$ so that the linear dispersion (8.5) holds.*

Proof. Let us write $c = c_1 + ic_2$ and denote by F_1, F_2 the real and imaginary parts of the left-hand side of (8.5), respectively. We show that the Jacobian determinant is nonzero at $(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_1, c_2) = (0, 0, U_0, 0)$. Thanks to Lemmas 7.3 and 6.2 with noting that $c_1 = U(z_c)$ so that $\partial_{c_1} z_c = 1/U'_c$ and $\partial_{c_2} z_c = 0$, we can compute

$$\partial_{c_1} F_1(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_1, c_2) = -1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$$

Thus, with $(\alpha, \varepsilon) = 0$, $z_c = 0$, and $c_1 = U(0)$, we have $\partial_{c_1} F_1(0, 0, U(0), 0) = -1$. Similarly, we also have

$$\partial_{c_2} F_2(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_1, c_2) = -1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha),$$

and thus $\partial_{c_2} F_2(0, 0, U(0), 0) = -1$. Finally, it is easy to see that $\partial_{c_2} F_1(0, 0, U(0), 0) = \partial_{c_1} F_2(0, 0, U(0), 0) = 0$. Therefore the Jacobian determinant of $F = (F_1, F_2)$ with respect to $c = (c_1, c_2)$ is equal to one, whereas the Jacobian determinant of the real and imaginary parts of the right-hand side of (8.5) is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. The standard Implicit Function Theorem can therefore be applied, together with Lemmas 7.3 and 6.2, to conclude the existence of $c = c(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ in a neighborhood of U_0 . $\square$

8.4 Lower stability branch: $\alpha_{\text{low}} \approx R^{-1/4}$

Let us consider the case $\alpha = AR^{-1/4}$, for some constant A . We recall that $\delta \approx (\alpha R)^{-1/3} = A^{-1/3} R^{-1/4}$. That is, $\alpha \approx \delta$ for fixed constant A . By a view of (8.7), we then have $|z_c| \approx C\delta$. More precisely, we have

$$z_c/\delta \approx A^{4/3}. \quad (8.8)$$

Thus, we are in the case that the critical layer goes up to the boundary with z_c/δ staying bounded in the limit $\alpha, \epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

We prove in this section the following lemma.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\alpha = AR^{-1/4}$. For R sufficiently large, there exists a critical constant A_c so that the eigenvalue $c = c(\alpha, \epsilon)$ has its imaginary part changing from negative (stability) to positive (instability) as A increases past $A = A_c$. In particular,*

$$\text{Im } c \approx A^{-1} R^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. By taking the imaginary part of the dispersion relation (8.5) and using the bounds from Lemmas 6.6 and 7.4, we obtain

$$(-1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)) \text{Im } c + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 \log \alpha) = \text{Im} \left(\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2}). \quad (8.9)$$

which clearly yields $\text{Im } c = \mathcal{O}(\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2})$ and so $\text{Im } c \approx A^{-1} R^{-1/4}$. Next, also from Lemma 7.4, the right-hand side is positive when z_c/δ is small, and becomes negative when $z_c/\delta \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, together with (8.8), there must be a critical number A_c so that for all $A > A_c$, the right-hand side is positive, yielding the lemma as claimed. $\square$

8.5 Intermediate zone: $R^{-1/4} \ll \alpha \ll R^{-1/6}$

Let us now turn to the intermediate case when

$$\alpha = AR^{-\beta}$$

with $1/10 < \beta < 1/4$. In this case $\delta \approx \alpha^{-1/3} R^{-1/3} \approx A^{-1/3} R^{\beta/3-1/3}$ and hence $\delta \ll \alpha$. That is, the critical layer is away from the boundary: $\delta \ll z_c$ by a view of (8.7). We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\alpha = AR^{-\beta}$ with $1/6 < \beta < 1/4$. For arbitrary fixed positive A , the eigenvalue $c = c(\alpha, \epsilon)$ always has positive imaginary part (instability) with*

$$\text{Im } c \approx A^{-1} R^{\beta-1/2}.$$

Proof. As mentioned above, z_c/δ is unbounded in this case. Since $z_c \approx \alpha$, we indeed have

$$z_c/\delta \approx A^{4/3} R^{(1-4\beta)/3} \rightarrow \infty,$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$ since $\beta < 1/4$. By Lemma 7.4, we then have

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2}) \approx A^{-1} R^{\beta-1/2}, \quad (8.10)$$

and furthermore the imaginary of $\phi_3/\partial_z \phi_3$ is positive since $z_c/\delta \rightarrow \infty$. It is crucial to note that in this case

$$\alpha^2 \log \alpha \approx R^{-2\beta} \log R,$$

which can be neglected in the dispersion relation (8.9) as compared to the size of the imaginary part of $\phi_3/\partial_z \phi_3$.

This yields the lemma at once. $\square$

8.6 Upper stability branch: $\alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/6}$

The upper branch of marginal stability is more delicate to handle. Roughly speaking, when the expansion of $\phi_{1,\alpha}$ involves ϕ_2 , independent solution of Rayleigh equation which is singular like $(z - z_c) \log(z - z_c)$. This singularity is smoothed out by Orr Sommerfeld in the critical layer. This smoothing involves second primitives of solutions of Airy equation. As we take second primitives, a linear growth is observed (linear functions ϕ_R are obvious solution of (4.2)). This linear growth gives an extra term in the dispersion relation which can not be neglected when $\alpha \sim R^{-1/6}$. It has a stabilizing effect and is responsible of the upper branch for marginal stability.

8.7 Blasius boundary layer: $\alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/10}$

In the case of the classical Blasius boundary layer, we have additional information: $U''(0) = U'''(0) = 0$. Hence, $U''(z_c) = \mathcal{O}(z_c^2)$, and so by a view of (3.7), the expansion for $\phi_{2,0}$ reduces to

$$\phi_{2,0} = -\frac{1}{U'_c} + \mathcal{O}(z_c^2)(U(z) - c) \log(z - z_c) + \text{holomorphic}.$$

That is, the singularity $(z - z_c) \log(z - z_c)$ appears at order $\mathcal{O}(z_c^2)$, instead of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as in the general case. This yields that the singular term A_s that appears in (6.11) is of the form:

$$A_s = \chi \text{Diff}(e^{-\alpha z}(U - c)) + \chi \text{Diff}(\mathcal{O}(\alpha z_c^2)).$$

Propositions 5.1 and 4.13 thus yield

$$\| \text{AirySolver}_\infty(A_s) \|_\eta \leq C\epsilon + C\alpha^3\delta(1 + |\log \delta|)(1 + |z_c/\delta|),$$

upon recalling that $z_c \approx \alpha$. The dispersion relation (8.9) then becomes

$$(-1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)) \text{Im } c + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^4 \log \alpha) = \text{Im} \left(\frac{\phi_3(0; c)}{\partial_z \phi_3(0; c)} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\delta(1 + |z_c/\delta|)^{-1/2}). \quad (8.11)$$

A simple calculation shows that the right hand side, which has a negative imaginary part, remains to dominate $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4 \log \alpha)$ as long as $\alpha \ll \alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/10}$. The fact that $\alpha_{\text{up}} \approx R^{-1/10}$ is the upper stability branch follows from the same reasoning as discussed in the general case.

References

- [1] Drazin, P. G.; Reid, W. H. *Hydrodynamic stability*. Cambridge Monographs on Mechanics and Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University, Cambridge–New York, 1981.
- [2] S. Friedlander, N. Pavlović, and R. Shvydkoy, Nonlinear instability for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 264 (2006), no. 2, 335–347.
- [3] S. Friedlander, W. Strauss, and M. M. Vishik, Nonlinear instability in an ideal fluid, *Ann. I. H. P. (Anal Nonlin.)*, 14(2), 187–209 (1997).
- [4] Grenier, E. On the nonlinear instability of Euler and Prandtl equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 53, 9 (2000), 1067–1091.
- [5] E. Grenier, Y. Guo, and T. Nguyen, Spectral instability of symmetric shear flows in a two-dimensional channel. Preprint 2013.
- [6] Heisenberg, W. Über Stabilität und Turbulenz von Flüssigkeitsströmen. *Ann. Phys.* 74, 577–627 (1924)
- [7] Heisenberg, W. *On the stability of laminar flow*. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Cambridge, Mass., 1950, vol. 2, pp. 292–296. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1952.
- [8] C. C. Lin, *The theory of hydrodynamic stability*. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1955.
- [9] F. W. J. Olver, *Airy and related functions*, NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions. Online source: <http://dlmf.nist.gov/9>
- [10] W. Orr, Stability and instability of steady motions of a perfect liquid and of a viscous fluid, Parts I and II, *Proc. Ir. Acad. Sect. A, Math Astron. Phys. Sci.*, 27 (1907), pp. 9–68, 69–138.
- [11] Rayleigh, Lord, On the stability, or instability, of certain fluid motions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 11 (1880), 57–70.
- [12] V. Romanov, Stability of plane-parallel Couette flow, *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 7 (1973), pp. 137–146.
- [13] H. Schlichting, *Boundary layer theory*, Translated by J. Kestin. 4th ed. McGraw–Hill Series in Mechanical Engineering. McGraw–Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1960.
- [14] A. Sommerfeld, Ein Beitrag zur hydrodynamischen Erklärung der turbulenten Flüssigkeitsbewegung, *Atti IV Congr. Internat. Math. Roma*, 3 (1908), pp. 116–124.

- [15] O. Vallée and M. Soares, *Airy functions and applications to physics*. Imperial College Press, London; Distributed by World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2004. x+194 pp.
- [16] W. Wasow, The complex asymptotic theory of a fourth order differential equation of hydrodynamics. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 49, (1948). 852–871.
- [17] W. Wasow, Asymptotic solution of the differential equation of hydrodynamic stability in a domain containing a transition point. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 58, (1953). 222–252.
- [18] W. Wasow, *Linear turning point theory*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 54. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985. ix+246 pp.